



United States  
of America

# Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 115<sup>th</sup> CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 163

WASHINGTON, FRIDAY, JANUARY 13, 2017

No. 9

## House of Representatives

The House met at 9 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON).

### DESIGNATION OF THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,

January 13, 2017.

I hereby appoint the Honorable MICHAEL K. SIMPSON to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

PAUL D. RYAN,

*Speaker of the House of Representatives.*

### PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Patrick J. Conroy, offered the following prayer: Loving and gracious God, we give You thanks for giving us another day.

We ask today that You bless the Members of this assembly to be the best and most faithful servants of the people they serve. Purify their intentions, that they will say what they believe and act consistent with their words.

Help them to be honest with themselves so that they will be concerned not only with how their words and deeds are weighed by others, but also with how their words and deeds affect the lives of those in need and those who look to them for support, help, strength, and leadership.

May all that is done this day in the people's House be for Your greater honor and glory.

Amen.

### THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 1, rule I, I demand a vote on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8, rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

### PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman from Washington (Mr. HECK) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. HECK led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will entertain up to five requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

### OBAMACARE FAILURES

(Mr. COLLINS of Georgia asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, today, we come and find this one

truism: ObamaCare showed that a Federal Government takeover of health care is not in the best interest of addressing our healthcare system.

Today, we are going to be taking a closer look at the top three ObamaCare failures: premiums have gone up, not down; instead of lowered costs, healthcare prices have gone up; and people have less choice than ever before.

Before we examine these, let's remember how we got here. There seems to be some selective amnesia on this floor. It was after months of backroom deals, in the middle of the night, last-minute deals, and without giving the American people enough time to even read the bill. That is not what is going to happen this time. Republicans are going to do what we said we would do: listen to the American people.

We are going to do this right, with input from our neighbors, the folks we go to church with, and our families and our communities. We are not going to pull the rug out from under anyone.

We have listened to our constituents, and what we are hearing over and over again are the same three failures: premiums have gone up, not down; instead of lowered costs, healthcare prices went up; and people have less choice than ever before, which, in many cases, is no choice at all. This is a failure, Mr. Speaker, and it is time to end.

### ACA AND AMERICANS WITH DISABILITIES

(Mr. HOYER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I absolutely disagree with the previous speaker. He is wrong. He is wrong on the facts. The fact is, the Affordable Care Act was on the table longer than any bill since I have been in Congress—which is 36 years—to read, to review, to analyze, and to make a decision.

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

H475

Every American will be adversely affected if we repeal the Affordable Care Act. Millions of Americans with disabilities depend on access to quality, affordable health care and deserve to have their voices heard in the debate over our healthcare system.

In fact, only one in five Americans, when polled, think we ought to repeal the Affordable Care Act without having a replacement. There is no replacement. Sixty-four times they voted to repeal the Affordable Care Act. They still do not have a replacement.

According to the CDC, 53 million Americans live with some form of disability. Were the Affordable Care Act to be repealed, insurers would again be permitted to discriminate against them, denying coverage for increasing premiums based on their disabilities. Repeal would also allow insurance companies again to impose annual and lifetime limits on coverage for every American.

Do not repeal the Affordable Care Act. Show us the beef. Show us the alternative.

#### PREMIUMS HAVE GONE UP, NOT DOWN

(Mr. MESSER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. MESSER. Mr. Speaker, ObamaCare is built on broken promises.

President Obama promised that, through his healthcare law, premiums would go down. Instead, they have gone up. In most States, premiums have increased by double digits. In some States, like Oklahoma, premiums are going up by as much as 76 percent.

I am from Indiana. In Indiana, in 2017, based upon current enrollments, the average rate will increase by 18.7 percent. Overall, the premiums in Indiana have gone up by 70 percent since the Affordable Care Act was first enacted.

Not only are Americans paying more for coverage, the costs have gone up as well: out-of-pocket costs, deductibles. For 2017, four carriers will be selling on the Indiana Marketplace. I have one county in my district, Wayne County, where no carriers provide for the local hospital.

Today, we will start a process of keeping our promises, Mr. Speaker. We promised the American people that we would repeal and replace this failed healthcare law. Only in Washington would keeping your promise somehow be controversial.

#### KEEP THE ACA

(Mr. HECK asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HECK. Mr. Speaker, I have a constituent named Martha. She goes by Marty.

Marty was studying to earn her bachelor's degree in nursing at Pacific Lu-

theran University when she was diagnosed with rectal cancer. Not good.

Without medical insurance, as we all know, that is a certain death sentence. There is no other way about it. But it wasn't for Marty. Frankly, less than a year before she had finally found affordable healthcare insurance for herself through the Washington State Health Benefit Exchange.

Every family, every person in this Chamber, has been affected by it. Cancer has a way of ripping bodies apart, ripping families apart, and ripping communities apart.

It didn't rip Marty apart. Through her strength, courage, and health insurance, she persevered. She has conviction that God used her community of friends and her family and the Affordable Care Act to help her through treatment and into recovery.

Not only could Marty share that story with me back in 2015, but she graduated cum laude from PLU in nursing just this last December. I am sharing her remarkable story with you—it could be replicated millions of times—to urge you to set aside and rise above partisan politics and not repeal the lifesaving Affordable Care Act. I ask you to do this not just for the sake of Marty, but because there, my friends, but for the grace of God, go each and every one of us.

#### WE ARE HERE TO FIX OBAMACARE

(Mr. JENKINS of West Virginia asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. JENKINS of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, the ACA, ObamaCare, or whatever you want to characterize it as, is broken, and we are here to fix it. We want to empower patients. We want to bring health care back to the American people.

Let me talk about access to insurance coverage. People have less access today to insurance coverage than at actually any time in the past. Instead of competition to bring down and drive down insurance costs, one-third of the counties in the United States have only one choice of an insurance carrier, which is no choice at all. No competition. Insurance carriers are pulling out of the exchanges en masse, citing unsustainable costs because of ObamaCare.

The American people are demanding change. Enough is enough. They want relief. They want competition. They want lower costs. They want better quality.

We are here to fix ObamaCare and honor the promise to the American people to empower the patients of America to give them the choice, the quality, and the cost control they so desperately need and that ObamaCare robbed them of.

#### NOT ATTENDING INAUGURATION

(Mr. GRIJALVA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1

minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to tell my constituents that I will not be attending the inauguration of Donald Trump as our next President.

My absence is not motivated by disrespect for the office or motivated by disrespect for the government that we have in this great democracy but as an individual act, yes, of defiance at the disrespect shown to millions and millions of Americans by this incoming administration and by the actions we are taking in this Congress.

The majority of voters rejected Trump. They deserve respect. The 20 million-plus Americans threatened by the repeal of the Affordable Care Act without a replacement deserve respect. The millions who did not vote because they blame both parties deserve respect.

I will be at home in Arizona meeting with seniors, the immigrant community, folks who care about the environment and climate change, healthcare providers, and marching in Tucson with folks who will demand respect. I will be talking about the need to defend and protect the future for all Americans.

Rather than participate in the inauguration, I will be participating in my district and reaffirming and renewing this democracy and the people that are part of it.

#### SAVE CHRISTIANS IN THE MIDDLE EAST

(Mr. ROHRBACHER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ROHRBACHER. Mr. Speaker, today, I will reintroduce legislation entitled, Save the Christians From Genocide Act. The bill declares Christians and Yazidis in Iraq, Syria, Pakistan, Iran, and Libya as targets of genocide, and thus gives them a priority for immigrant and refugee visas.

Importantly, this bill does not circumvent or change current vetting processes, but rather simply ensures that these targets of genocide are placed at the front of the line for immigration and refugee visa processing.

The Save the Christians From Genocide Act was submitted but not brought to the floor for a vote in the last Congress. During that time, thousands of Christians have been killed and often turned into helpless and hopeless refugees on the run from radical Islamic terrorism. The Save the Christians From Genocide Act will give Middle East Christians a safe haven.

Christians are being slaughtered. As we speak today, Christians are being slaughtered in the Middle East. We must save them if we can.

#### MENTAL HEALTH AND THE ACA

(Mrs. NAPOLITANO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Mr. Speaker, one of ObamaCare's most critical successes was increased mental health services.

Because of ACA, over 48 million are now covered by mental health and parity laws. Insurance companies can no longer deny coverage for patients needing mental health services, but we do need tougher enforcement on this, as well as the insurance rate increases.

The ACA expanded Medicaid, the single largest payer of behavioral health services, to a new population. That has allowed over 1.6 million Americans to gain access to substance abuse treatment.

Last month, we signed into law reforms to mental health and substance abuse grants and services. Repealing ACA would harm those advances. ACA should be strengthened, not repealed, so more Americans have access to life-saving mental health services.

We must move mental health forward, not back. Support ACA.

□ 0915

#### STOP THIS MADNESS

(Ms. GABBARD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. GABBARD. Mr. Speaker, the American people have directly felt the cost of our Nation's interventionist wars, a cost borne by our Nation's sons and daughters who have served and by communities and people in every part of this country.

We have spent trillions of dollars on regime-change wars in the Middle East while communities like mine in Hawaii face a severe lack of affordable housing, aging infrastructure, the need to invest in education, health care, and so much more.

Our limited resources should go toward rebuilding our communities here at home, not fueling more counter-productive regime-change wars abroad. I have introduced the Stop Arming Terrorists Act, legislation that would stop our government from using taxpayer dollars to directly or indirectly support groups who are allied with and supporting terrorist groups like ISIS and al Qaeda in their war to overthrow the Syrian Government.

The fact that our resources are being used to strengthen the very terrorist groups we should be focused on defeating should alarm every American. I urge my colleagues to support this bipartisan legislation and stop this madness.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF S. CON. RES. 3, CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2017, AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF S. 84, PROVIDING FOR EXCEPTION TO LIMITATION AGAINST APPOINTMENT OF PERSONS AS SECRETARY OF DEFENSE WITHIN SEVEN YEARS OF RELIEF FROM ACTIVE DUTY

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 48 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

#### H. RES. 48

*Resolved*, That at any time after adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 3) setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2017 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2018 through 2026. The first reading of the concurrent resolution shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the concurrent resolution are waived. General debate shall not exceed two hours, with 90 minutes of general debate confined to the congressional budget equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Budget and 30 minutes of general debate on the subject of economic goals and policies equally divided and controlled by Representative Tiberi of Ohio and Representative Carolyn Maloney of New York or their respective designees. After general debate the concurrent resolution shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. The concurrent resolution shall be considered as read. No amendment shall be in order except the amendment printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. Such amendment may be offered only by the Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, and shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent. All points of order against such amendment are waived. After the conclusion of consideration of the concurrent resolution for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the concurrent resolution to the House with such amendment as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the concurrent resolution and on any amendment thereto to adoption without intervening motion. The concurrent resolution shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question of its adoption.

SEC. 2. Upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (S. 84) to provide for an exception to a limitation against appointment of persons as Secretary of Defense within seven years of relief from active duty as a regular commissioned officer of the Armed Forces. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The bill shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and on any amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) 90 minutes of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Armed Services; and (2) one motion to commit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Georgia is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. McGOVERN), my good friend, pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 48 provides for consideration of S. Con. Res. 3, the FY17 budget resolution, as well as consideration of a bill to move forward on the process of confirming our civilian Secretary of Defense, former General Mattis.

Mr. Speaker, the rule is a structured rule today to move expeditiously on both of these measures, and in the time we have gotten to spend together, Mr. Speaker, you know I am a fan of the festival of democracy that can be the Committee on Rules process, particularly the appropriations process. But there are times where moving expeditiously is required, and today is one of those days.

You are not going to see a rule like this come very often because we are considering the FY17 budget resolution today. Historically, as you know, in this Chamber, when we get ready to consider budget resolutions, Mr. Speaker, we are considering every single one that any Member of Congress would have an opportunity to write. That process takes place every spring to meet the statutory deadline of passing budgets by April. This is not that budget today, Mr. Speaker.

This is a budget, as you know, to move us forward on a reconciliation process to finish up the FY17 budget process, and rather than considering all the amendments that one might have to offer, we have made in order just one. It is the Democratic substitute. It is offered by my good friend, the ranking member on the Committee on the Budget, Mr. YARMUTH, and it is absolutely worthy of the Membership's consideration. But it is not going to be a vote-a-rama on every budget known to mankind. It will be the underlying budget from the House Committee on the Budget as well as one substitute from the ranking member.

Mr. Speaker, when it comes to consideration of the measure to waive a statutory prohibition on naming a civilian Secretary of Defense who has been out of the military for less than 7 years, we are also offering that under a closed rule today. No amendments are going to be made in order. You may not know, Mr. Speaker, but that is the

only statutory change that has passed the United States Senate in 2017.

When we talk about having to move expeditiously, when we talk about whether or not we are going to have an open process or a closed process, understand that while this body has passed dozens of statutory changes in just these first 9 days of legislative activity, the Senate has passed but one. This is in anticipation of an inauguration of a President on January 20. This is in anticipation of trying to fill out a Cabinet. This is in anticipation of trying to make sure that civilian leadership is in place on day one to lead and to serve the men and women of the United States military.

This is not the time to have that vote-a-rama. This is the time to move expeditiously, again, with a bill that has passed in a bipartisan way in the other Chamber. I look forward to getting back into the business of leading the Senate, not following the Senate. I look forward to getting back in the business of voting on absolutely every idea that Members bring to this floor.

Today, Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this rule so that we can move expeditiously on two of our priorities: passing that FY17 budget resolution and ensuring the speedy confirmation of the civilian leader of the Department of Defense.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. WOODALL) for yielding me the customary 30 minutes, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Mr. MCGOVERN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in very strong opposition to this restrictive rule, and I rise in strong opposition to the underlying legislation.

Because of Republican in-fighting, Congress was unable to do one of its most basic jobs last year, passing a full budget for FY17. So now House Republicans have brought this budget bill to the floor, but we all know that this is just a vehicle for them to repeal the Affordable Care Act and take away health care from millions and millions of Americans.

For nearly 7 years, my Republican friends have railed against the Affordable Care Act. Their well-funded allies have spent billions of dollars distorting the ACA and lying to the American people about what it actually does. And for nearly 7 years there has not been a single comprehensive healthcare bill brought to the floor by Republicans as a replacement for the Affordable Care Act. Not one.

We have voted over 60 times to repeal the ACA on the House floor. I will be the first to admit that ACA is not perfect, but rather than work together to tweak it or to make it better, all we get from them are repeal bills, repeal bills, repeal bills. Let me again point out that not once, not once, was there a replacement bill offered.

Not only do Republicans not have a plan to replace the Affordable Care Act and protect access to health care for more than 20 million Americans who gained coverage, they can't even agree on a timeline for when they will pass their replacement. President-elect Trump says repeal and replace will be done on the same day, and he wants it to happen now. Representative STEVE SCALISE said Republicans will replace the ACA over the course of the next few months. Senator JOHN THUNE said it could take 2 or 3 years for the replacement to be implemented. Representative CHRIS COLLINS said Republicans have 6 months to work out the replacement plan, and Senator MITCH MCCONNELL refused to even give a timeline, just saying that it would happen.

Well, while the Republicans fight with each other over timelines, I think it is appropriate to ask: If they did have a replacement, what would that replacement be?

Well, President-elect Trump has the answer. When asked what we should replace ObamaCare with, he said: "Something terrific." When pressed for further details, and more specificity, he said: "Something that people will really, really, really like."

Mr. Speaker, you can't make this stuff up. It would be laughable if it weren't so tragic. It is tragic because what Republicans are trying to do is take healthcare protections away from millions and millions of families.

Now, no one in this Congress has to worry about health care if the Affordable Care Act is repealed, and the Donald Trumps of the world certainly don't have to worry about health care if the Affordable Care Act is repealed. If someone in their family gets really sick, they will just sell some stocks or close down another American factory or not pay their workers, as our President-elect has been known to do on many, many occasions.

But for millions of Americans, it will be a different story. Repealing the ACA would mean over 30 million Americans would lose coverage, including nearly 4 million children. More than 52 million individuals with preexisting conditions could have coverage rescinded or see their premiums dramatically increased. Millions of young adults would be unable to stay on their parents' plans until they are 26. Over 14 million individuals enrolled in Medicaid under the expansion would lose coverage, and nearly 140 million individuals with private insurance would lose access to preventive services without copays and deductibles. And millions of seniors would see their prescription drug prices increase because it would reopen the so-called doughnut hole that the ACA has begun to close.

Republicans want to slash Medicaid, a healthcare program that does a lot of good stuff and enables mothers to work their way out of poverty by providing affordable coverage for their children. As someone who represents Massachu-

setts, this is especially personal because Medicaid is one of the best tools we have in the fight against opioid addiction, providing real care for the addiction and underlying conditions that drive the opioid epidemic in our communities. Repealing Medicaid expansion under the ACA would rip coverage away from an estimated 1.6 million newly insured individuals with substance use disorders.

That is what is at stake, and that is what my Republican colleagues are so happy, giddy, and excited to do. It is sad. It is pathetic, but they are moving forward anyway with no replacement in sight. I suppose they can roll out their oldies but goodies, like health savings accounts or their other healthcare prescription, take two tax breaks and call me in the morning. But that doesn't do it.

Mr. Speaker, we have a complicated healthcare system, no doubt. I wish it were simpler. That is why I have always favored a single-payer system and that is why I favored a public option. But the problem with our system before ObamaCare was that it left all the decisions up to the insurance companies.

Do you remember the days when insurance companies could charge women more for health insurance because they said being a woman was a preexisting condition?

They can't do that anymore. Why? Not because of my Republican friends. They can't do it anymore because we passed the ACA.

This budget bill would also give Republicans a green light to defund Planned Parenthood. To my colleagues who are so anxious to defund Planned Parenthood just to satisfy their right-wing base, let me ask: Have you ever visited a Planned Parenthood clinic? Because if you had, you would understand why what you are doing is so wrong.

□ 0930

The fact is that Planned Parenthood plays a critical role in protecting and providing access to critical health services for both women and men. One in five women has relied on a Planned Parenthood health center for care in her lifetime, and Planned Parenthood serves 2.7 million patients each year. One of the most important statistics that my Republican friends like to ignore is that more than 90 percent of what Planned Parenthood does nationally is preventive care, including cervical cancer screenings, breast cancer screenings, and family planning, not abortion services.

Add to this fact that Planned Parenthood clinics are often one of the few affordable healthcare options available for many women. Nearly 80 percent of women using Planned Parenthood clinics have incomes at or below 150 percent of poverty. It is easy to see why a majority of Americans don't think Federal funding should be eliminated. In one recent poll, 63 percent of voters,

including 72 percent of independents, do not agree with my Republican friends that Federal funding for Planned Parenthood should be eliminated.

In fact, we also heard very little about the consequences that defunding Planned Parenthood would have for families across the country. One of the biggest myths perpetrated by Republicans is the idea that our Nation's community health centers, which I love and adore and respect, could suddenly pick up the slack if Planned Parenthood is defunded.

For the millions of low-income women who depend on Planned Parenthood clinics, defunding them would mean the loss of affordable and accessible contraceptive services and counseling, as well as breast and cervical cancer screenings. Simply put, for the many communities served by Planned Parenthood clinics, recklessly cutting funding would wipe out access to vital health services for the people who need them the most.

Let me make something very clear. Zero Federal dollars go towards the abortion services provided by Planned Parenthood—zero. The vast majority of funding that Planned Parenthood receives comes in the form of Medicaid reimbursements for preventive care that they provide.

Mr. Speaker, it is a cruel thing to do, to take away people's health care. I will say to my Republican colleagues that they need to know that we are going to fight you every step of the way on this. There are some battles on behalf of the American people that are worth having and worth fighting, and this is one of them—making sure that their health care protections remain intact. I came to Congress to help people, not make their lives more miserable.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, let me comment briefly on the other piece of legislation in this rule, S. 84. General James Mattis has been praised by both Democrats and Republicans, but there is very real concern about civilian control over the military, the language of the underlying legislation, and the duties and responsibilities of the House of Representatives.

General Mattis has a distinguished career, but we are talking about changing the law here. Approving a waiver for him to serve in the Cabinet so soon after his military service is a serious decision. It is so serious that such a waiver has happened only once before in the entire history of the United States. Now, we should debate this. Instead, the Trump transition team canceled General Mattis' testimony before the House Armed Services Committee and now expects us to vote for him willy-nilly without us being able to ask him any questions.

Congress is supposed to be a check on the executive branch, but if the House is denied the opportunity to meet with and question the military officer who is nominated as our next Defense Sec-

retary, how can we fulfill our duty and blindly just vote for him?

I would also say to my Republican friends, this is an early warning sign of the disregard that this new administration has for the House of Representatives. General Mattis was willing to testify, but the Trump team said no. They said no to the House of Representatives. Caving in on this issue will only mean continued disregard for the people's House in the future, and I think that that is regrettable.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, it is my great pleasure to yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COLE), who probably knows more about the Health and Human Services Appropriations bill than anyone else in this Congress, the cardinal from that committee in the 114th Congress.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his kind words and for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the rule and the underlying legislation. As has been made clear, we are actually talking about two different pieces of legislation here today.

The waiver for Secretary-designee James Mattis is, quite frankly, a no-brainer. The Senate voted 81-17 in favor of that waiver. I would suspect there will be similar bipartisan support here.

My friend is correct, of course; this is a serious matter whenever we grant exceptions to the law. But General Mattis is just uniformly and universally respected across the lines for his distinguished work in defense of this country, so I hope we move ahead on that.

The budget resolution that comes before us is another matter, and there will be a great deal of contention. Frankly, the resolution itself is not, as my good friend from California pointed out, and should not be seen as, a traditional budgetary item. It is, frankly, a projection of what will happen if we do absolutely nothing over the next decade and leave the current set of policies in place.

It is a sobering document to read in that regard because it shows rising deficits every single year for a decade, beginning at over \$580 billion and then moving well north of \$1 trillion. Frankly, in my view, it is something that we ought to look at and come to the realization that we are going to need to do entitlement reform in the next decade, something that people on both sides of the aisle seem to want to ignore. Absent that, we will, indeed, have extraordinary budget deficits, and they will be large enough to undercut and undermine our economy.

The budget resolution is also a vehicle, a tool, to begin to repeal the Affordable Care Act. This is necessary for, really, one simple reason. The Affordable Care Act, or ObamaCare as it is popularly known, is a failing system. It is unpopular. It has never been popular, never hit 50 percent of popularity.

Frankly, in my view, it has cost our friends their majority in the House, then cost them their majority in the Senate, and may well have cost them the Presidency of the United States. The American people have spoken pretty emphatically: We don't like this product. And it is collapsing financially right now. This is not a system that is an operation that is really doing well.

Let me just talk about my own State. We have about 197,000 people that have gotten insurance under ObamaCare. This year, they will have exactly one choice as to what company they want to choose to provide them, and their rates will go up by 69 percent. Now, nationally, I think the average is over 25 percent.

Clearly, this is not a system that is working very well. Politically, the easy thing to do would be what our friends want us to do—let's just leave it alone. It will fall under its own weight, and it will be very clear who is responsible for that collapse: the current administration and my friends on the other side. But that also would be the irresponsible thing to do, and that would be, in itself, an abdication of leadership and, ultimately, unfair to the American people.

Instead, we are going to repeal the system and begin to replace it with something that will work better. Now, my friend's point is a fair one. There is not a single plan out there, but there are plenty of plans. I know I cosponsor a couple myself. I think we will be able to work through this relatively easily.

There has been a lot of discussion and a lot of diagnosis about what the failures of ObamaCare are, but there has been very little in the way of actual legislative remedy. We have a unique opportunity to do that. Frankly, I am proud of our Speaker, and I am proud of our conference that they are going to seize that and begin this process because I don't think there is anything more important facing us.

So I would urge the passage of the rule and then the passage, obviously, of the underlying legislation, particularly the budget resolution that allows us to begin the necessary work in repealing and replacing ObamaCare, and, obviously, the waiver that would allow us to have a distinguished Secretary of Defense, General Mattis.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I want to point out a couple of things.

First of all, according to the Brookings Institution, without the ACA, insurance premiums would be 44 percent higher.

And the other fact I point out for my colleagues is that healthcare costs are growing at the slowest rate in the last 50 years. Families are spending over \$3,500 a year less than they would have because of the ACA. I would say to my colleagues, yeah, we want to do better, but let's work to address some of the shortcomings of the ACA rather than repeal it and put in danger all these healthcare protections that people have.

I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN).

Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN. Mr. Speaker, we are in week 2 of this 115th Congress, and, as promised, my colleagues and I are here to stand up for this good Nation. Unfortunately, House Republicans cannot say the same.

Last night, they decided that nursing home coverage for millions of seniors, comprehensive health care for young children, and the benefits earned after a lifetime of hard work are not worth fighting for. That is exactly why the gentleman from Wisconsin offered an amendment to ensure that the budget resolution being considered today could not be used to cut benefits from three critically important programs: Medicaid, Medicare, and Social Security.

In fact, the President-elect promised many times that he would neither cut Social Security benefits for seniors nor would he support cuts to Medicaid and Medicare. But the rule under consideration this morning fails to allow a debate or vote on this amendment, which places the earned benefits and the financial future of American people at risk.

Who are my Republican colleagues looking out for? Certainly not their constituents.

It is clear that we are faced with a Republican-controlled Congress that is ensuring the divided and self-serving rhetoric that echoed throughout this campaign season rings true. This is not democracy. This is not outlined in our Constitution. This is not the democracy we are sworn to protect.

With that, I urge my colleagues to reject this rule.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds to thank my colleague for her admonition to reject divisive and self-serving rhetoric because I think that is absolutely something we should take to heart.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. NEWHOUSE), a member of the Rules Committee and a new member of the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, I thank my good friend from Georgia for yielding me this time to speak on these important issues.

Mr. Speaker, the opportunity to speak on this important rule that provides consideration for the fiscal year 2017 budget resolution and S. 84, which provides a legal exception for General Mattis to serve as Secretary of Defense, certainly are important issues. As a member of the House Rules Committee, I am very proud to support this rule as well as both of the underlying measures.

S. 84 provides a one-time exemption on behalf of an individual who is uniquely qualified to serve during a very challenging period in our Nation's history and a time when U.S. national security and military readiness is of paramount importance for both Americans and our allies around the world.

This legislation does not permanently change the law nor does it diminish the founding principle of civilian control of our military. In fact, this rule allows for consideration of legislation providing for a one-time exemption that does exactly the opposite. It reinforces the doctrine of civilian control of our military. By setting into motion this unique procedure, the people's elected representatives are taking the seriousness of this circumstance to heart, to debate and carefully weigh granting a historic exception, only provided on one other occasion in our history.

The man at the center of this matter demonstrates the extraordinary nature of the situation we currently face. General James N. Mattis has served our Nation with unparalleled distinction over the past 40-plus years. Born in Pullman, Washington, General Mattis grew up in my congressional district, the Fourth District of the State of Washington. He attended what was then Columbia High School, now Richland High, and graduated from Central Washington University.

It was growing up along the banks of the Columbia River in Richland where General Mattis' parents instilled in him a deep passion for reading, which then developed into a renowned lifelong devotion to intellectualism, military and world history, and the study of war.

General Mattis has been in command at increasing levels throughout his career within the United States Marine Corps, where he began as a student enrolled in ROTC, rose to the rank of general, and served as commander of the United States Central Command responsible for American military operations in the Middle East, Northeast Africa, and Central Asia. Few individuals command the respect and admiration General Mattis has earned amongst the troops, national security experts, and military and civic leaders.

This rule allows for the consideration of legislation to provide the United States Senate its proper role of advice and consent regarding the nomination of General Mattis to serve as our next Secretary of Defense.

□ 0945

I urge my colleagues to support this rule so the Senate can rightfully provide its constitutional guidance, which I am confident will overwhelmingly support this distinguished leader and public servant from the great State of Washington.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on the previous question. If we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule to allow for the consideration of Representative POCAN's amendment, of which I am a proud cosponsor, to create a point of order against any legislation that would cut benefits under Social Security, Medicare, or Medicaid or that

would attempt to privatize Social Security. All are things that my Republican friends have advocated for in previous budgets.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD the text of the amendment, along with extraneous material, immediately prior to the vote on the previous question.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. POCAN).

Mr. POCAN. I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote "no" and defeat the previous question so that we can bring up my amendment, which would block the House GOP majority from cutting Medicare, Medicaid, and Social Security.

President-elect Donald Trump has promised many times throughout his campaign that he would not cut Social Security benefits for seniors nor would he support cuts to Medicare or Medicaid benefits. In fact, at least 15 times he said he would not make cuts to Medicare or Social Security. He even tweeted it; so we know he really, really meant it.

If it is important to the Democrats and if it is important to the President-elect and if it is important to the American people, let's make sure it is absolutely certain that no one has to worry about a cut in one's Social Security and Medicare benefits—not a single cut to anyone. If we could do that, that would be the single biggest success of the 115th Congress.

If you support the idea that you will not cut Social Security and Medicare and that you will protect the promise to our constituents, then support this amendment. But if you are not sure yet or if you might be willing to cut Social Security and Medicare or if you are actually considering cutting these programs, then you should oppose this amendment.

Again, our amendment would block any legislation before the House or Senate which cuts guaranteed, earned benefits under Social Security, Medicare, or Medicaid programs; which increases the retirement age for these benefits or which privatizes Social Security. Nationally, over 64 million people receive benefits from Social Security.

I want to read a couple of comments from constituents from the State of Wisconsin, the home State of Speaker PAUL RYAN and mine.

Robyn from Mount Horeb, Wisconsin, said: "Please do everything in your power to oppose Speaker RYAN's legislation to privatize Social Security and Medicare. These are our earned benefits for a lifetime of working as dairy farmers."

Carol from Madison said: "I am a retired Navy veteran and a cancer survivor. My grandfather, a World War II

and Korean war vet, is living in a home on Medicaid and Medicare. What is going to happen to him if . . . Republicans are successful in drastically altering these programs?"

Democrats believe we need to protect our senior citizens and the most vulnerable in our society. Democrats believe we need to strengthen the middle class through the preservation of Social Security and Medicare, and so do the American people.

Do Republicans share our belief? Let's make it crystal clear. Do you want to protect Social Security and Medicare, or do you want to cut these earned benefits? You can decide that with this vote.

I urge my colleagues to vote "no" and defeat the previous question so we can bring up the CPC—the Pocan-Ellison-Grijalva-Lee-Schakowsky amendment—and find out who truly supports Medicare and Social Security in this House.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Reluctantly I recognize that we are, apparently, not going to have an end to divisive, self-serving rhetoric. I am still optimistic, as it is a long year ahead of us.

What the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. POCAN) is suggesting, Mr. Speaker, is that we ensure the failure of Social Security going forward. The only guaranteed benefit in Social Security is that it is guaranteed to fail. Those are not my words. These are the words of the actuaries who are in charge of protecting Social Security. The non-partisan actuaries who govern Social Security say that there is not enough money today to pay the benefits that folks are expecting. The law of the land, as it exists today, requires that, when that day comes, benefits will get cut dramatically. Only a 75 percent realization of benefits is what the law requires that befalls our senior citizens. If we pass the amendment that is suggested by my friend, we would be prohibited from considering any solutions to that problem. Means testing, which my colleagues have advocated for years, is off the table under that scenario.

Mr. Speaker, to suggest that anyone on this side of the aisle wants to undermine the commitment that this country has made to our seniors is ludicrous; but to suggest that I go to a 22-year-old, whose polling today suggests he or she believes they are more likely to see a UFO in their lifetime than a Social Security check in their lifetime—to suggest that going to that 22-year-old and my thinking that maybe his retirement age would be a year or two higher than his great-grandparents' since he is now living decades longer—I will remind my colleagues we came together in a bipartisan way to raise the retirement age from 65 to 67 in 1983, not because one of us hated seniors and one of us loved seniors, but because we all believed in our commitment to seniors.

Mr. Speaker, don't let the RECORD reflect anything other than that this budget resolution provides the framework to begin this discussion, to begin the discussion of what comes next. There is not a single line of authorizing language in this budget resolution. Any suggestion that the law will change tomorrow because of this budget resolution is false. The law will be the same tomorrow as it was yesterday. The difference is we have begun a path—we will have created a framework; we will have provided the tools—to have a discussion about how to solve very real problems in this country.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Let me respond to my colleague, the gentleman from Georgia, by saying that I don't know what he is talking about. The Pocan amendment is pretty clear. It says that there will be a point of order against any legislation that would cut the benefits under Social Security, Medicare, or Medicaid or would attempt to privatize Social Security.

Now, I know my Republican friends want to privatize Social Security, because they tried that in the past; and I know they want to privatize Medicare and turn it into a voucher system, because that is what their budgets continually do. I mean, that is what we are trying to prevent.

If you want to privatize Social Security, if you want to privatize Medicare and turn it into a voucher system, then stand with them. But if you want to protect these programs—and the vast majority of Americans—Democrats, Republicans, and Independents want to protect the integrity of Social Security, Medicare, and Medicaid—then oppose this budget.

By the way, this budget, basically, is the green light to go ahead and destroy the protections that people value in this country.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER), the distinguished ranking member of the Rules Committee.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I thank my colleague for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, it is unconscionable to me that the majority is prioritizing a repeal of the Affordable Care Act as its top priority for the 115th Congress as the Nation's infrastructure crumbles and as the cost of education continues to skyrocket. It is particularly outrageous that this budget puts the wheels in motion, as my colleague has said, for a repeal of the healthcare law without there being anything to take its place.

This budget would also increase our Nation's debt by \$9.5 trillion over the next 10 years. Apparently the party that has tried to claim the mantle of balanced budgets for years doesn't really care about fiscal responsibility.

It is the first step toward defunding Planned Parenthood, which serves 2.5 million patients—men and women—

across the country every year and provides preventative care, like birth control and cancer screenings. It seems to me, for the majority of my adult life, I have been trying to defend Planned Parenthood. The excuse given that the community health centers can pick up the slack is so enormously wrong that the community health centers are scared to death that they are going to be asked to try to pick up that slack of 2.5 million patients. That is absolutely a cover for something that doesn't make any sense at all.

I was shocked to read a study over the summer that found that the rate of pregnancy-related deaths in the State of Texas, since they did away with Planned Parenthood, seems to have doubled since 2010, making Texas one of the most dangerous places in the world to have a baby.

What was happening in Texas during this time?

The State legislature was not only making cuts to family planning clinics where many low-income women received the only medical care they got, but the State was absolutely refusing to expand its Medicaid program, which would have given lower income women desperately needed access to prenatal services.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. MCGOVERN. I yield the gentlewoman an additional 1 minute.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. The point being—and one of the things we talked about last night at Rules—is that, of the many States in which the premiums, they thought, had gone reasonably high, these were also the States that did not expand Medicaid or set up the exchanges, which were intended to cut the costs. While the causes of maternal deaths are complex, certainly leaving women without access to medical care will not do anything to decrease that mortality rate.

Today my Republican friends want to inflict the same harm on pregnant women all over the country by taking away the Medicaid expansion and by taking away money for clinics like Planned Parenthood. I cannot believe that in this day and age and in this century it is even contemplated. I know the American people are paying attention because every day in my office we get between 20 and 30 calls—and have for the last 2 or 3 weeks—begging us not to repeal the ACA.

This agenda has the potential to devastate millions of people from coast to coast. Instead of solving problems, the majority is on the verge of creating new ones for families all across the country.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

The gentleman from Massachusetts said in his opening statement that he didn't come to Congress to hurt people; that he came to help people. I want to stipulate that that is 100 percent true. There is no one in this Chamber who I believe has a bigger heart for men and



women than the gentleman from Massachusetts, which is why I know that he does not support what I see happening to my constituency.

He says people are paying less for their health care today. I dispute those numbers writ large, but I know it is true in my district because the free healthcare clinic has doubled since the passage of ObamaCare. Folks once had access to small plans that they chose for their families. Those plans were outlawed. Now they have high deductible plans that are worthless to them, so they seek care at the free clinics. I know that ripping the plans out from under those men and women in my district was not the gentleman's intention when he passed the Affordable Care Act, but it is absolutely the result.

I know that when the gentleman set up those exchanges, which all Americans were supposed to be able to go to to buy their healthcare plans, he did not intend for those plans to get canceled year after year after year after year, because they were unsustainable. We all know, of the constituents in our districts who did what the government told them to do, they lost the plans their employers used to provide; they went to the exchanges to buy a plan; and, 1 year later, those plans were canceled. They went through the process again: they picked out other plans; they went through the exchanges and paid their money; and, 1 year later, those plans were canceled again and again.

We all know those constituents; so to suggest that the only reason someone would come to the floor today would be to solve a nonexistent problem is ridiculous. We all know that there are problems. What is ridiculous are the folks who would come and defend the status quo. The status quo is indefensible, Mr. Speaker.

When we get together, we can do amazing things. There are vast experiences of the Members in this Chamber, Mr. Speaker, and our bringing those to the table leads to better solutions. We have spent 6 years being stuck in the status quo, and this bill represents an opportunity to turn the page on that status quo, and I know every single Member has constituents in his district who will welcome it.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1000

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I just want to help the gentleman understand the benefits of the ACA in his home State of Georgia:

There are 468,000 individuals in the State who have gained coverage since the ACA was implemented, and now they could lose it if he gets his way.

478,000 individuals in the State who were able to purchase high-quality marketplace coverage now stand to lose that coverage if the gentleman gets his way.

In 2016, 427,000 individuals in the State have received financial assist-

ance to purchase marketplace coverage; they are at risk of losing that.

65,000 kids have gained coverage since the ACA was implemented in the State of Georgia.

74,000 young adults are able to stay on their parents' health insurance until they are 26 because of the ACA.

That is all in Georgia. So I would hope the gentleman would understand what is happening in his own State before he votes to repeal it.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. COURTNEY).

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Speaker, last night Speaker RYAN told a national audience on CNN ObamaCare is crumbling. Donald Trump has said over and over again ObamaCare is a disaster. I would like to share just a tiny fraction of the emails my office has received in the last few days to demonstrate that the opposite is true:

Peter, a 63-year-old farmer from Ellington, Connecticut:

ACA has allowed me and my wife access to quality health care. If this law is repealed, either I sell off my land and livestock or go without insurance.

Becky, a 41-year-old small-business owner and single mom from Enfield, before ACA hadn't seen a doctor in 4 years. Now, she and her kids have a plan for \$315 a month.

George, a 53-year-old freelance designer from Niantic: the past 2 years, he and his wife with preexisting conditions have been covered by an affordable plan.

Michelle, a registered nurse with health issues from Killingworth, has the same message.

Sue from Vernon, her husband has cancer.

Barbara from North Stonington, a 59-year-old registered nurse, has a chronic condition.

All are watching this destructive process with outrage. For these people, the only thing that is crumbling is their confidence in Congress to do the right thing and stop this rush to repeal.

As George from Niantic said:

I have never been so worried for my country.

Vote "no" on repeal. Vote "no" on the rule.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I was not in Congress at the time the Affordable Care Act passed, but I remember it, watching from home. We talk about this as if it was some sort of thoughtfully crafted piece of legislation that folks are so tremendously proud of. I happen to have the numbers here, Mr. Speaker.

It was H.R. 4872 that moved through the House, that was the authorizing part. We had three votes in the U.S. House of Representatives on that bill. We had a motion to recommit, as it was not actually a healthcare bill to begin with, and a vote on final passage.

Then it went over to the U.S. Senate where they worked their will on it.

They had 43 votes on it, amendments offered, ideas, and changes.

Then it came back to the House where we changed it not at all. There was one straight partisan vote on the Affordable Care Act. Not one idea from the U.S. House of Representatives added, not one change from the U.S. House of Representatives, not one alteration of any kind.

As you recall, Mr. Speaker, they had a filibuster-proof majority in the United States Senate, so Democrats could work their will any way they wanted. When they lost that filibuster-proof majority—they only had 59 votes out of 100 instead of 60—they ended debate, they ended discussion, they ended collaboration and jammed what they had passed at midnight on Christmas Eve right on through the U.S. House of Representatives. I can't imagine who defends that as the proper outcome of the legislative process. We have a chance to change that, Mr. Speaker.

I am glad that my friend from Connecticut has some constituents that have benefited. I have some constituents that have benefited. But I have constituents who are being failed, and I know my friend from Connecticut does, too.

I am glad that my friends on the other side of the aisle are talking about all of their success stories, but I want my friends to join me and grapple with all of the failures.

I will not deny the way the conversation about health care has changed since the passage of the Affordable Care Act—folks talking about preexisting conditions, folks talking about lifetime caps, folks talking about keeping young kids on their policies until they are 26.

I just don't understand why my colleagues would deny that folks who used to have care, now don't. Folks who used to have affordable plans, now don't. Folks who used to be able to take care of their employees through their small business plans, now can't. This is undisputed, and we have an opportunity to do better. I hope my colleagues will join me in doing that.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

The gentleman from Georgia (Mr. WOODALL) is entitled to his own opinions but not his own facts. The facts with regard to the process in which the Affordable Care Act was developed, I think, are worth repeating here.

In the House of Representatives, we held nearly 100 hours of hearings and 83 hours of committee markups. The House heard from 181 witnesses, both Democrats and Republicans. 239 amendments were considered in the three committees of jurisdiction, and 121 of them were adopted. The bill was available for 72 hours before Members were asked to vote on the floor.

In the Senate, the Senate Finance Committee held more than 53 hearings. The committee also spent 8 days marking up the legislation, the longest



markup in the 22 years of the committee. The Senate Health Committee held 47 bipartisan hearings, roundtables, and walkthroughs on the healthcare reform bill.

So to say that this was not a thoughtful process is just wrong.

Compare that to the way this budget bill is being brought to the floor. There is no committee consideration, no deliberation. It is just given to us. In fact, most of the committees aren't even organized yet in the House of Representatives.

So there is a contrast there, and I stand with the way we approached the Affordable Care Act as opposed to the way the Republicans have approached this budget deal.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SOTO).

Mr. SOTO. Mr. Speaker, here is my 1-minute breakdown on why I oppose repealing ObamaCare without replacement:

First, this law protects all Americans with preexisting conditions; second, it keeps all young adults on their parents' insurance until age 26; third, it protects all Americans from bankruptcy if they get sick by removing lifetime caps.

Before the act, millions of Americans were simply kicked off their insurance when these problems arose. We Democrats support keeping these protections for all Americans, and the Republicans want to repeal them. We support improving the act, and the Republicans want to eliminate it.

While many have stoked fear and spread false information for political gain, it is clear that repeal without replacement equals disaster. It will eliminate these protections for all Americans, create chaos for working families, and send our country into another recession.

It is clear we need to improve the act rather than repeal it. It is time to do the right thing for all Floridians and for all Americans.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to share with my friend from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN) that one is not entitled to their own facts, but one is also not entitled to share just half the story and leave it as if it is the entire story.

Everything the gentleman from Massachusetts said was true, until the U.S. House abdicated any responsibility whatsoever and passed exactly what the Senate did with no amendment whatsoever. All of the work product the gentleman talked about, all of the work that the gentleman talked about went for naught in this U.S. House of Representatives.

To deny that this is not the bill that folks wanted to have crafted is to deny reality. To deny that this is not the bill that folks wanted to have crafted is to deny the nine different times the Republican House and Senate sent to the President repeals of ObamaCare, things that were so broken even the

President couldn't live with it and he signed those repeals into law.

Mr. Speaker, I am not trying to denigrate any of the motives of my friends on the other side of the aisle. I just can't understand, for the life of me, why they don't want to try to do better.

That pride of authorship, that arrogance, it has a real impact on the men and women that I serve, and I am asking my friends to partner with me to help me fix it. But if they won't partner with me, I am going to move forward and fix it anyway.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

We have been willing to work with our Republican friends to try to improve the Affordable Care Act for nearly 7 years. They have been unwilling to work with us in a bipartisan way. Instead, they just want to repeal, repeal, repeal.

Now, I don't know what their motivation is. Maybe it is because they don't like President Obama. Judging from some of the rhetoric that we have heard on this House floor over these years, I think some of the Members over there actually hate the President of the United States, and this is all driven by this personal animosity.

Let me just say to the gentleman that the Affordable Care Act may have started out with a different bill number, but the facts remain that there were hundreds of hours of hearings on the Affordable Care Act, 181 witnesses testified; hundreds of amendments were considered in committee.

The process of using a different bill number is very common in both Chambers. In fact, the House Republicans have done it several times in the past 3 years. Regardless of the bill number, the work that went into forming this legislation was one of the most open processes in the history of the Congress, and it has resulted in providing protections and health care for millions and millions of people in this country. All of that is at risk with this budget resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER).

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, I agree with the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN). I was in the middle of hundreds of hours of discussion and debate in committee, on the floor. It is amazing to think of all the time and energy that went into it.

Was it a perfect bill? Absolutely not. It would have been much better if the legislative process hadn't collapsed in the Senate and forced reconciliation as the vehicle.

The offer to somehow become bipartisan and work together to solve the problems ring hollow. I have been on the Ways and Means Committee for the last 6 years when Republicans were in charge with constant efforts to repeal ObamaCare, but they refused to work with us to fine-tune the legislation

when we could move forward and build on this foundation and not be in a situation where we are going to unsettle healthcare markets, leave people doubting about where they are, and having no clue about what comes forward.

There is a reason, after 6 years, the Republicans do not have an alternative to offer now. It is because their wildly contradictory promises cannot be met.

I urge rejection of the rule and rejection of this effort to gut the most important healthcare reform in the last 50 years.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SHIMKUS).

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, I am on the Energy and Commerce Committee the healthcare bill came through. We can debate how many hearings, how many questions, and all of that. The public has rendered judgment on this healthcare law.

In 2010, Republicans took back control of the House over two issues: ObamaCare and cap-and-trade. And then our base was saying to repeal ObamaCare, all the way back to 2010.

In 2014, the Republicans took over the Senate. Our base is saying: You have got the House. You have got the Senate. Repeal ObamaCare. It is harmful. It is destructive—and I will tell you why in a minute.

So why should anybody not expect us, in 2016, when the public has rendered judgment again in a national election that we have to repeal ObamaCare?

So when I talk to my constituents and people talk to me, this is going to happen, and we know there is going to be a replacement.

There are two different ideologies of how to provide care. We believe in markets; you believe in centralized control. We believe in people choosing the best plan for them in the private markets; and those who need help and assistance to get in those markets, we are going to help them get in those markets. But to have our Federal Government say that you only have one of four choices—my constituents pay for health care that they can't use because they can't pay the deductibles, so they are forced to buy something that they can't use.

So this is timely. I am glad we are moving expeditiously, and we look forward to the year ahead.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, we believe healthcare protections ought to be enshrined in the law and not left up to insurance companies.

I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO).

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to the rule. It sets into motion the repeal of the Affordable Care Act.

This repeal-only bill takes money intended to fund health care for middle class families and it hands it to the wealthy families and to big health corporations in the form of tax cuts. The public does not know this.

According to the Center on Budget and Policy Priorities, this bill would give the 400 highest income families in the United States an average tax cut of \$7 million a year. It would rob millions of families of the money they need for their insurance. It hands it over to the wealthy, including nearly \$250 billion over 10 years in tax cuts for health insurance companies and drug manufacturers.

□ 1015

Where are the majority's values? We should be providing more Americans with health insurance, not fewer; and we should be creating jobs, not eliminating them. This bill is a disgrace. It is a betrayal of the working families of this Nation.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds just to say absolutely none of that is true. Absolutely not one word of that is true. This bill does not one of those things. This bill does, in fact, nothing to change the law at all in any way, shape, or form. It is not true. This bill provides a process for debating the law, and I certainly hope we will pass it so we can have that debate.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. KHANNA).

Mr. KHANNA. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this bill which will set forth the repeal of ObamaCare. But I also am concerned that the bill doesn't have a basic amendment which would allow for the importation of drugs from Canada.

Senator SANDERS courageously, on Wednesday night, went on the floor and introduced an amendment to allow for the importation of drugs from Canada that the overwhelming number of Republicans and Democrats support. It was appalling that 13 Senate Democrats voted against the Sanders amendment, and they did so because the pharmaceutical industry is a cancer on this body; the pharmaceutical companies' contributions are a cancer.

We need to allow for the importation of drugs, we need that to be an amendment to this bill, and we need to take it up as a body.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I advise my friend from Massachusetts I do not have any further speakers and would be happy to close when he is prepared.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO).

Ms. DELAURO. A report by Families U.S.A. said that repeal of the Affordable Care Act equals a huge tax cut for the wealthy.

What people don't know, and the public doesn't know at the moment, is that this will hand over to wealthy and major corporations new tax breaks worth nearly \$600 million—more than a half-trillion dollars over 10 years, \$345.8 billion over 10 years in tax cuts for people whose incomes are over a specified

threshold; \$200,000 for single individuals; and \$250,000 for families. There are \$274.4 billion over 10 years going to health insurance companies, drug manufacturers, and other large healthcare corporations.

That is what repeal of the Affordable Care Act does. My colleagues need to face up to that, and the public needs to know it.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD a letter from the American Medical Association, a letter from 120 interfaith groups, a letter from the Consumers Union, a letter from the Massachusetts Health & Hospital Association, a letter from a number of labor organizations in my home State of Massachusetts, and a letter from UMassMemorial Community Healthlink, which is a provider of comprehensive health care in my district. They are all opposed to undoing the Affordable Care Act.

AMERICAN MEDICAL ASSOCIATION,

Chicago, IL, January 3, 2017.

Hon. MITCH MCCONNELL,  
Majority Leader, U.S. Senate,  
Washington, DC.

Hon. CHARLES E. SCHUMER,  
Democratic Leader, U.S. Senate,  
Washington, DC.

Hon. PAUL RYAN,  
Speaker, House of Representatives,  
Washington, DC.

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,  
Democratic Leader, House of Representatives,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR MAJORITY LEADER MCCONNELL, LEADER SCHUMER, SPEAKER RYAN AND LEADER PELOSI: On behalf of the physician and medical student members of the American Medical Association (AMA), I am writing regarding our ongoing commitment to reform of the health care system and potential legislative actions during the first months of the 115th Congress.

The AMA has long advocated for health insurance coverage for all Americans, as well as pluralism, freedom of choice, freedom of practice, and universal access for patients. These policy positions are guided by the actions of the AMA House of Delegates, composed of representatives of more than 190 state and national specialty medical associations, and they form the basis for AMA consideration of reforms to our health care system. (A summary of key AMA objectives for health system reform is attached.)

Health system reform is an ongoing quest for improvement. The AMA supported passage of the Affordable Care Act (ACA) because it was a significant improvement on the status quo at that time. We continue to embrace the primary goal of that law—to make high quality, affordable health care coverage accessible to all Americans. We also recognize that the ACA is imperfect and there a number of issues that need to be addressed. As such, we welcome proposals, consistent with the policies of our House of Delegates, to make coverage more affordable, provide greater choice, and increase the number of those insured.

In considering opportunities to make coverage more affordable and accessible to all Americans, it is essential that gains in the number of Americans with health insurance coverage be maintained.

Consistent with this core principle, we believe that before any action is taken through reconciliation or other means that would potentially alter coverage, policymakers

should lay out for the American people, in reasonable detail, what will replace current policies. Patients and other stakeholders should be able to clearly compare current policy to new proposals so they can make informed decisions about whether it represents a step forward in the ongoing process of health reform.

We stand ready to work with you to continue the process of improving our health care system and ensuring that all Americans have access to high quality, affordable health care coverage.

Sincerely,

JAMES L. MADARA, MD,  
Executive Vice President, CEO.

JANUARY 12, 2017.

DEAR PRESIDENT-ELECT TRUMP AND MEMBERS OF THE U.S. CONGRESS: We the undersigned members of the investment and public health communities want to re-affirm our deep commitment to a more accessible and affordable health care system by voicing our support for the continued expansion of coverage under the Affordable Care Act (ACA).

In order for our economy to thrive and Americans to prosper, our health care system must be both equitable and efficient. As a result of ACA's implementation, quality and affordable health insurance has been guaranteed to more than 20 million previously uninsured Americans. While the ACA has dramatically expanded coverage, we support reforms within the framework of the Act to further contain rising health care costs.

We agree that thoughtful improvements to the ACA are needed, but we are deeply concerned by threats to repeal and/or replace the ACA before these improvements are implemented. Repeal of the ACA would destroy the tremendous strides we have made as a nation in expanding coverage, would have a destabilizing effect on jobs, businesses and our economy, and would further jeopardize the health and financial security of millions of Americans.

We call on you, our elected leaders to:

- 1) Preserve the Affordable Care Act.
- 2) Work collaboratively with all key stakeholders to improve the ACA and better rein in health care costs.
- 3) Make the fiscal and political commitment necessary to expand quality health care coverage to all Americans.

We pledge to do our part to support the ACA and expanded health care coverage through our own operations and beyond, and request that as legislators and leaders of our nation entrusted with the health of all Americans, you will do the same.

Sincerely,

Interfaith Center on Corporate Responsibility; Adrian Dominican Sisters; Amalgamated Bank; American Baptist Home Mission Society; Arc Advisers, LLC; Augustinian Province of St. Thomas of Villanova; Benedictine Sisters; Benedictine Sisters of Baltimore; Benedictine Sisters of Florida; Benedictine Sisters of Holy Name; Benedictine Sisters of Mount St. Scholastica; Benedictine Sisters of the Sacred Heart; Benedictine Women of Madison, Inc.; Benet Hill Monastery; Bon Secours Health System, Inc.; Boston Common Asset Management; BVM Shareholder Education & Advocacy Group; CHRISTUS Healthcare; Clean Yield Asset Management.

Congregation of Divine Providence Inc.; Congregation of Holy Cross, Moreau Province; Congregation of Sisters of St. Agnes; Congregation of St. Basil; Congregation of the Sisters of Charity of the Incarnate Word; Congregation of the Sisters of Divine Providence; Corporate Responsibility Office of the Sisters of Charity of Nazareth; Daughters of Wisdom; Dignity Health; Diocese of Springfield, IL; Dominican Sisters, Sparkill; Dominican Sisters, Grand Rapids; Dominican

Sisters of Hope; Dominican Sisters of Houston; Dominican Sisters of Peace; Dominican Sisters of San Rafael; Dominican Sisters of Springfield, IL; Dooley Center; Earth Equity Advisors.

Evergence and the Praxis Mutual Funds; Felician Franciscan Sisters; Felician Sisters—Buffalo Region; Franciscan Action Network; Franciscan Sisters of Perpetual Adoration; FundX Investment Group; Glenmary Home Missioners; Green America; Health Care Without Harm; Holy Name Monastery; Horizons Sustainable Financial Services, Inc.; Incarnate Word Associates; Incarnate Word Convent; Incarnate Word Sisters; IWBS Associate; Jantz Management LLC; Leadership Council of the Sisters, Servants of the Immaculate Heart of Mary—Monroe, MI; Marist Fathers.

Maryknoll Sisters; Mennonite Education Agency; Midwest Coalition for Responsible Investment; Miller/Howard Investments, Inc.; Missionary Oblates of Mary Immaculate; Missionary Oblates of Mary Immaculate, JPIC Office; MomsRising; Mount St. Scholastica Monastery; Newground Social Investment; NorthStar Asset Management, Inc.; Northwest Coalition for Responsible Investment; Peace/Justice Committee, Benedictine Sisters of FL; Progressive Asset Management; Region VI Coalition for Responsible Investment; Religious of the Sacred Heart of Mary WAP; S&C North America; SC Ministry Foundation; School Sisters of Notre Dame Cooperative Investment Fund; School Sisters of St. Francis.

Sinsinawa Dominican Peace and Justice Office; Sinsinawa Dominican Shareholder Action Committee; Sisters of Bon Secours USA; Sisters of Charity BVM; Sisters of Charity Cincinnati; Sisters of Charity of New York; Sisters of Charity of the Incarnate Word; Sisters of Charity, Halifax; Sisters of Incarnate Word and Blessed Sacrament; Sisters of O.L. of Christian Doctrine; Sisters of St. Dominic of Blauvelt, NY; Sisters of St. Dominic of Caldwell, NJ; Sisters of St. Dominic, Racine, WI; Sisters of St. Francis of Philadelphia; Sisters of St. Joseph; Sisters of St. Joseph of Boston; Sisters of St. Joseph of Chestnut Hill, Philadelphia, PA; Sisters of St. Joseph of Orange; Sisters of St. Joseph of Springfield; Sisters of the Good Shepherd.

Sisters of the Holy Cross; Sisters of the Humility of Mary; Sisters of the Incarnate Word; Sisters of the Incarnate Word & Blessed Sacrament; Sisters of the Presentation; Sisters of the Presentation of the BVM; Socially Responsible Investment Coalition; Society of Mary (Marianists); SRI Investing LLC; St. Jude League; Stardust; The Pension Boards—United Church of Christ, Inc.; Trillium Asset Management; Trinity Health; Tri-State Coalition for Responsible Investment; Unitarian Universalist Association; United Church Funds; United Methodist Women; University Presbyterian Church; Ursuline Sisters of Tildonk, U.S. Province; Ursulines of the Roman Union—Eastern Province; Veris Wealth Partners; Walden Asset Management; Zevin Asset Management, LLC.

CONSUMERS UNION,  
January 11, 2017.

House of Representatives,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE MCGOVERN: On behalf of Consumers Union, the public policy and mobilization arm of nonprofit Consumer Reports, I write to express our deep concern that the budget resolution for fiscal year 2017 will begin a process that could lead to the repeal of several key parts of the Affordable Care Act (ACA), and could result in tens of millions of Americans losing vital health coverage and the destabilization of insurance markets. As an organization whose founding

principles include ensuring access to quality, affordable health coverage and care for all, Consumers Union is concerned that this would jeopardize both the health and financial stability of American families.

Consumers Union has a long history of working for a fairer and more just marketplace for consumers. We believe all Americans deserve care and coverage that is accessible, affordable, understandable, fairly priced, and meets high, uniform standards for quality and safety. The Affordable Care Act was an important step towards this goal, allowing more than 20 million consumers to purchase private insurance through exchanges or benefit from the Medicaid expansion, thus lowering the uninsurance rate in our nation to its lowest point ever.

The ACA also includes a number of critical consumer protections that benefit all consumers, regardless of the source of their coverage. The law prevents insurers from discriminating against consumers with pre-existing conditions or charging them more for coverage, prohibits insurers from imposing annual or lifetime limits on coverage, and ensures coverage of a comprehensive package of essential health care services. It also takes steps to measure and improve the safety and quality of care received by all. Consumers Union opposes legislative changes that would eliminate or weaken these critical consumer protections.

A move to repeal the ACA without a simultaneous replacement that, at minimum, maintains coverage for the number of people currently covered and provides comparable consumer protections would be irresponsible and affect every American family. It could destabilize the individual market for those who buy insurance for themselves, resulting in fewer choices for consumers and sending premiums skyrocketing while benefits shrink. Consumers do not want to go back to a time in which health insurers ran unchecked and insurance coverage was out-of-reach and unreliable for so many Americans.

Consumers Union strongly urges you to oppose the repealing of the Affordable Care Act.

Sincerely,

LAURA MACCLEERY,  
Vice President, Consumer Policy and  
Mobilization, Consumer Reports.

MASSACHUSETTS HEALTH &  
HOSPITAL ASSOCIATION,  
January 12, 2017.

Hon. ELIZABETH WARREN,  
U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.  
Hon. E. RICHARD NEAL,  
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.  
Hon. NIKI TSONGAS,  
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.  
Hon. KATHERINE M. CLARK,  
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.  
Hon. MICHAEL E. CAPUANO,  
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.  
Hon. WILLIAM KEATING,  
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.  
Hon. EDWARD J. MARKEY,  
Senate, Washington, DC.  
Hon. JIM MCGOVERN,  
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.  
Hon. JOSEPH P. KENNEDY, III,  
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.  
Hon. SETH W. MOULTON,  
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.  
Hon. STEPHEN F. LYNCH,  
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MEMBERS OF THE MASSACHUSETTS CONGRESSIONAL DELEGATION: On behalf of our member hospitals and health systems, the Massachusetts Health and Hospital Association (MHA) opposes the repeal of the Affordable Care Act (ACA). MHA is a founding member of the new Massachusetts Coalition for Coverage and Care that was formed to

preserve and improve access to health insurance coverage in Massachusetts and to protect the gains in access to care, health, and health equity that have resulted from near universal coverage. We stand ready both as an individual organization and as a coalition member to provide you the information and resources you will need to oppose efforts to repeal the ACA.

As you know, Massachusetts has been a pioneer in expanding health coverage over the years, including our state's historic 2006 health reform law that served as a model for the ACA. We believe our state serves as an example of how the ACA's approach to expanding access to affordable health coverage can be successful nationally if given the time and support it deserves. With 10 years now passed since then-Governor Mitt Romney signed our initial health reform initiative into law, we can proudly say that the commonwealth is better off than where we stood in 2005. We know we share this sentiment with other Massachusetts healthcare providers, insurers, the employer community, government leaders, and, most importantly, Massachusetts consumers and families. With time, support, and improvements to the ACA, we know the country will value and appreciate the full benefits of ensuring access to affordable health coverage to all citizens as well as creating an environment for our health system to better manage its resources and deliver high-quality care.

While we were successful in achieving expanded coverage prior to the ACA, it took time and the collective effort of all stakeholders to achieve the reductions in uninsured. Expanding Medicaid was essential to providing coverage to the poorest individuals in our society. First through waivers and then through the ACA, the federal government has played an instrumental role in supporting coverage to economically challenged Massachusetts residents. Approximately 300,000 individuals now are covered due to the ACA's Medicaid expansion, many of whom would otherwise be unable to afford health insurance in the commercial market even with government subsidies.

Since 2006, our state's health insurance exchange has consistently served as a dynamic marketplace for those purchasing insurance in the small group and non-group market. In Massachusetts, we have modified our exchange to conform to the ACA and it remains as robust as it did 10 years ago. The state's Health Connector has experienced broad participation from many health insurers, with 10 insurers currently offering 62 insurance products. Lower and middle income individuals have relied on the exchange for the past decade to shop for affordable health coverage, benefitting from subsidy support, which now comes in the form of federal tax credits and co-payment subsidies. More than 234,000 individuals purchased their insurance coverage through the state's exchange in December, including more than 190,000 with the support of federal advanced premium tax credits. Another 1,300 small groups covering more than 6,000 lives also purchased insurance in the exchange.

The effect of these expansions in reducing the number of uninsured has been well documented. According to the United States Census Bureau, Massachusetts had 97.2% of its population covered with health insurance in 2015 compared to 89.3% for the three-year average between 2002 and 2005. This coverage expansion had its greatest effect on people with great healthcare needs, working adults with disabilities, younger adults, people with low incomes, and women—all who gained coverage at a faster rate than the general population. And while there are many statistics that highlight the achievements made in expanding coverage, there has been a tremendous positive effect on individual lives

as result of better access to care. Researchers have found improvements in physical health, mental health, functional limitations, joint disorders, and body mass index for those in Massachusetts, especially for those with low incomes, minorities, near-elderly adults, and women. Individuals here and around the country also no longer fear not being able to access health coverage due to pre-existing conditions or having inadequate health coverage during their times of medical need.

The cost of providing care to the uninsured also has been significantly reduced due to reform. In Massachusetts, our state's Uncompensated Care Pool covered hospital care for low-income uninsured and underinsured residents for decades. In FY2005 hospital uncompensated care costs totaled \$702 million, or \$992 million adjusting for inflation. This financial burden to hospitals, insurers, and government was yet another reason to address affordable coverage for low-income residents so care could be better managed with insurance coverage, including Medicaid. Hospital costs in the program's successor, now called the Health Safety Net, was \$407 million in FY2016—or 59% percent less than prior to our 2006 reform adjusting for inflation. While there have been some changes to the program over the years, undoubtedly the most significant contributor to this reduction has been the expansion of coverage. Also, it is impossible to calculate the unknown potential for increased numbers of uninsured if affordable health insurance had not been introduced in 2006 and maintained for the past 10 years.

A repeal of the ACA would turn back the clock here in Massachusetts. Attempting to revert back to our Massachusetts coverage programs that existed before the ACA would not be accomplished easily and would involve significant challenges related to the federal support needed for the current level of coverage as well as hospital uncompensated care for uninsured residents. The current subsidized insurance offerings in the state's Connector exchange are now built off of the ACA federal tax credit approach, and the financing of that coverage is heavily dependent on federal funding. On the Medicaid side, the ACA expanded Medicaid eligibility even in states like Massachusetts that had higher levels of Medicaid coverage through waivers. Massachusetts would likely need to seek a waiver to maintain that coverage through Medicaid if the ACA expansions were repealed. Of great concern, losing the ACA's enhanced federal Medicaid funding for these expansions would be a significant issue as the MassHealth program is already facing financial challenges with growing enrollment and reimbursement cuts to hospitals and other providers.

The ACA also ushered in profound innovations that have improved how healthcare is paid for and delivered. These enhancements improved quality of care, improved value, enhanced integration and collaborations in delivering care, and expanded preventive health screening. And other federal statutes, like meaningful use electronic medical record changes and the new Medicare physician payment law (MACRA), are designed to integrate with the ACA for success. The ACA included many less well known provisions that have improved the integrity of our healthcare system, such as the "sunshine" act provisions which greatly improved transparency in the financial relationships between clinicians and manufacturers. These are only a handful of the examples of how significantly the ACA has changed the way we deliver healthcare and, either directly or indirectly, has led to improvements in access and quality for everyone.

As you know, our hospitals are also in the midst of responding to an opioid use crisis,

increased prescription drug prices, a behavioral health system in drastic need of repair, and an aging patient population—all with limited financial resources. The Massachusetts healthcare system is also focused on improving the delivery of care and achieving cost savings through increased care coordination. The ACA aligns financial incentives and alternative payments as levers for improving healthcare quality while driving down costs. Without comprehensive health coverage, progress on all of these efforts will be seriously challenged.

In dollar terms the picture is very clear if the ACA were to be repealed—especially since a large part of the funding for the ACA came from payment cuts to hospitals, and since those cuts may continue despite repeal of essential ACA components. A recent study commissioned by the American Hospital Association (AHA) and Federation of American Hospitals (FAH) found that hospitals stand to lose \$289.5 billion in Medicare inflation updates alone from 2018 to 2026 if the payment cuts in the ACA are continued, and estimated further hospital losses of \$102.9 billion if Medicare and Medicaid disproportionate share hospital reductions are retained. The effect of these losses in Massachusetts would be \$12.3 billion over this time period, according to the study. The report also estimates that nationwide insurance coverage losses without a replacement would have an additional \$165.8 billion financial impact on hospitals in this same time period. The AHA/FAH analysis also estimates the cumulative federal payment reductions to hospital services that have been imposed through other actions subsequent to, and independent of, the ACA; these cuts total another \$148 billion nationally from 2010 to 2026, and come on top of the ACA cuts.

The ACA, like Medicare in 1965, has had its growing pains, but the benefits of the ACA far exceed any ongoing problems. As with any comprehensive law it has been a work in progress. We are still trying to review all the potential aspects of what repeal might mean, but simply getting beyond the key threats of repeal is difficult; the effect on coverage and on the Medicaid waiver programs, the end of quality initiatives, and the great hospital financial hit of not reversing the cuts in place to pay for expansion are all extraordinarily troubling. To our knowledge, no proposal has been floated that would actually maintain insurance coverage that now currently exists as a result of the ACA, or that would continue the quality and delivery system improvements now underway.

Our hospitals, and the thousands of healthcare employees in the commonwealth, are on the frontline of providing some of the best healthcare in the world. Every day Americans see the importance of access to high-quality, cost-effective healthcare, and millions more are insured because of the ACA. We will work with you to ensure that affordable health coverage is sustained so that our efforts can continue to focus on the payment and delivery reforms which remain underway.

Sincerely,

LYNN NICHOLAS,  
MHA President & CEO.

JANUARY 12, 2017.

Congressman JIM MCGOVERN,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN MCGOVERN: We write today on behalf of adults and children, persons with lived experience, family members, providers, and organized labor that make up the mental health and addiction disorders advocacy community to urge you to strongly oppose any major restructuring of the Medicaid program.

A study done by the Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration

(SAMHSA) concluded that one in five Americans experience a mental illness or addiction in any given year. The number of adults and children in the Commonwealth who need behavioral health care services is staggering. In 2015 in Massachusetts, about 4.2% of all adults aged 18 or older had a serious mental illness within the year prior to being surveyed; 46.2% of these individual did not receive any mental health treatment/counseling during that time period.

Massachusetts and the United States as a whole are in the midst of an unprecedented opioid epidemic. In Massachusetts, an estimated 1475 individuals died from January 2016 to September 2016. The first 9 months of 2016 saw a higher opioid overdose rate than the first 9 months of 2015. Nationwide, more people died from drug overdoses in 2014 than in any year on record, and the majority of drug overdose deaths (more than six out of ten) involved an opioid.

We know that recovery is possible for these individuals with effective treatment and supports, which is why preserving Medicaid funding for vital treatment services is so important.

In 2014, spending by Medicaid accounted for 25% of all mental health spending in the U.S. and 21% of all substance use disorder expenditures in the nation. People with behavioral health conditions are nearly one-third of the ACA expansion population.

Republican proposals to drastically restructure Medicaid will shift costs onto states and enrollees, restrict access to care, and increase the number of uninsured and underinsured. The ultimate goal of re-financing Medicaid into block grants/per capita caps is to massively cut the amount of federal spending for Medicaid. According to House Speaker Paul Ryan's proposed Medicaid plan, these proposed changes would result in a total of \$1 trillion in cuts to federal Medicaid spending over the next ten years. Massachusetts would then be forced to increase state spending on the Commonwealth's Medicaid program, and/or reduce eligibility, payments to providers, or benefits.

Proponents of the block grant/per capita cap approach have argued that states would gain greater flexibility in designing and managing their Medicaid programs. However, block grants/per capita caps will not provide any greater programmatic flexibility to states than they have under current law. States currently work with CMS through the section 1115 waiver process to tailor their Medicaid program to fit the needs of their specific state.

We are especially concerned about how many of the proposals being offered by the President-Elect and Republican members of Congress will impact access to vital behavioral health services. The pressure on state Medicaid programs and the corresponding efforts to reduce funding and eligibility will put mental health and substance use disorder services at significant risk. The risk to behavioral health services is so high because Massachusetts, like the rest of the nation, is not required to cover mental health and addiction treatment services as part of our state Medicaid program.

Over the past decade, the Commonwealth of Massachusetts has implemented many reforms to improve health care delivery in the Massachusetts. Despite these efforts, access to a robust continuum of behavioral health services continues to be a challenge for individuals living with a mental health and/or addiction disorder. Any changes that result in reduced funding for Massachusetts' Medicaid program will only exacerbate this problem as Medicaid continues to be the largest payer of these services across the Commonwealth.

It is imperative that adults, children and families be able to access the services they need, when they need them, where they need them. These services should be person-centered, outcome-oriented and clinically and cost effective. Massive cuts to Medicaid funding will make the provisions of such services almost impossible.

Thank you very much for your attention to this important matter. Our organizations are available at your convenience to answer any questions you or your staff may have in relation to our letter.

Sincerely,

Vicker DiGravio III, President/CEO, Association for Behavioral Healthcare; Monica Valdes Lupi, JD, MPH, Executive Director, Boston Public Health Commission; Emily Stewart, Executive Director, Casa Esperanza; Nancy Allen Scannell, Children's Mental Health Campaign; Erin Bradley, Executive Director, Children's League; Melody Hugo, Director, Clinicians United; John McGahan, President/CEO, Gavin Foundation & Recovery Homes Collaborative; Stephen Rosenfeld, Interim Executive Director, Health Care For All; Matt Selig, Executive Director, Health Law Advocates; David Matteodo, Executive Director, Massachusetts Association of Behavioral Health Systems; Danna Mauch, Ph.D., President/CEO, Massachusetts Association for Mental Health; Steve Walsh, President & CEO, Massachusetts Council of Community Hospitals.

Georgia Katsoulomitis, Executive Director, Massachusetts Law Reform Institute; Joseph Weeks, LMHC, President & Midge Williams, LMHC Executive Director, Massachusetts Mental Health Counselors Association; Maryanne Frangules, Executive Director, Massachusetts Organization for Addiction Recovery; Mark J. Hauser, M.D., President, Massachusetts Psychiatric Society; Mary McGeown, Executive Director, Massachusetts Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Children; Laurie Martinelli, LICSW, NAMI Massachusetts; Carol J. Trust, LICSW, Executive Director, National Association of Social Workers—MA Chapter; Lisa Lambert, Executive Director PPAL; Michael Weekes, President & CEO, Providers Council; Peter MacKinnon, President, SEIU 509; Siva Sundaram, Student Coalition on Addiction.

UMASS MEMORIAL  
COMMUNITY HEALTHLINK,  
January 10, 2017.

Attn: JENNIFER CHANDLER, Chief of Staff,  
Hon. Representative JIM MCGOVERN,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE MCGOVERN: On behalf of Community Healthlink located in Worcester, Leominster and Fitchburg Massachusetts, I am writing today to urge and request your support in protecting the Affordable Care Act and preserving Medicaid expansion in the 115th Congress.

We provide care to approximately 20,000 of the Commonwealth's most vulnerable individuals. We deliver outpatient mental health and substance abuse services, residential programs for those with mental illness and addiction, detoxification and stabilization services, emergency services for Worcester and North Central Massachusetts, for youth and adults. We also provide primary care for a significant number of adults in addition to services for the homeless in Worcester. The vast majority of our patients are Medicaid eligible and many of the adults are disabled due to mental illness. Though Massachusetts lead the way with covering all of its citizens, at this point the ACA provides a good deal of the funding that we need to continue to provide this near universal coverage.

Recent health insurance data show that Americans with mental health and substance use disorders are the single largest bene-

ficiaries of the Affordable Care Act's Medicaid expansion. Approximately one in three people who receive health insurance coverage through the Medicaid expansion either have a mental illness, substance use disorder or both simultaneously. By repealing the Medicaid expansion, this population of vulnerable American would be left without access to lifesaving treatment, driving up costs in emergency room visits and hospital stays.

Moreover, I am writing to urge your support for the protection of the Medicaid program from proposals to restructure Medicaid as a block grant or capped program. These proposals would reduce federal investment in Medicaid and leave millions of Americans without access to needed mental health and addiction treatment in our state and communities. Please work with your colleagues to protect our nation's most vulnerable patient population and preserve their access to treatment.

Thank you for your continued support. I would be honored to help you in any way possible.

Sincerely,

MARIE HOBART, MD,  
Chief Medical Officer,  
Community  
Healthlink Clinical  
Associate Professor  
of Psychiatry Uni-  
versity of Massachu-  
setts Medical School.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I urge all my colleagues to vote "no" on the previous question, and that would allow us to vote on an amendment by Mr. POCAN which would create a point of order against any legislation that would cut the benefits under Social Security, Medicare or Medicaid, or attempts to privatize Social Security.

So if you want to protect those programs, and if you are against privatizing Social Security, then vote against the previous question so we can bring this up.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, let me just say that this is a sad day because what we are doing here by voting for this budget is setting in motion a process to deny millions of people healthcare protections. I can't imagine why anybody would want to do that.

Is the Affordable Care Act perfect? No, and we are the first to admit it. We want to work in a bipartisan way to strengthen it, to make it better, and to make it less onerous on certain businesses. But my colleagues don't want to do that. They are determined just to vote for an outright repeal, and that is going to hurt countless people in this country, people who have now benefited from no preexisting conditions, people who have benefited from allowing their kids to stay on their insurance until they are 26, and senior citizens who have benefited from closing the doughnut hole. I could go on and on and on. All of that is about to be eliminated.

We are told that there will be replacement someday, somehow. For 6 years—over 6 years—you have been talking about repealing the Affordable Care Act and a replacement, and you haven't brought one bill to the floor—not one.

Now, we believe that health care ought to be a right; I know you don't.

We believe that healthcare protections ought to be in law; you believe they ought to be up to the insurance company. But this is a lousy thing to do. As I said in my opening statement, we are going to fight you on this. This is a fight worth having. Protecting people's health care is something that we all should be dedicated to, and we're going to fight you on this.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to address their remarks to the Chair.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I am fond of telling folks back home, Mr. Speaker, when they tell me they know exactly what is going to happen over the next 2 years, that I don't think they are telling me the truth. Because I confess to you, I have absolutely no idea what is coming over these next 2 years. I think these next 2 years are going to be unlike any we have seen in the history of self-government in this land; and, candidly, I am excited about that because the status quo isn't working for the 700,000 people that I represent.

I don't know what's going to happen over these next 2 years, but I believe that, for the first time, we are going to grapple with some really, really, really hard problems that folks on both sides of the aisle have been ignoring for too long.

Mr. Speaker, I don't question the commitment of my friends on the other side of the aisle to the American people. I question the legislation that they use to deliver it. You heard my friend from Oklahoma talk about premiums going up 67 percent for his constituents. That is indefensible. It is not okay. We can do better, and, with the passage of this budget resolution, we will have the tools to do that. I say again, the law will be the same tomorrow as it is today, but we will have the tools to grapple with these problems.

Eight million Americans were so failed by the Affordable Care Act that they paid a tax penalty instead of accessing care. That is not okay. I don't believe a single Member on the other side of the aisle decided they just wanted to tax young people instead of provide young people with quality care. This budget will give us the opportunity to have the tools to fix that problem.

Billions of dollars, Mr. Speaker, have gone into State-based co-ops that have failed, gone bankrupt, and terminated all of their plans which not only ripped health care out from under the American people, Mr. Speaker, but threw billions of dollars away in administrative costs at the same time. That is not okay. That is indefensible. We can do better. Passing this budget resolution will give us those tools.

Mr. Speaker, I made a commitment in the Rules Committee last night to do everything I could to stop poisoning the well of public discourse. Then I re-

upped for the Rules Committee, and I realized that is going to be a tough promise to fulfill. We have difficult work to do, and we are passionate about the quality of that work.

But, Mr. Speaker, we all know the status quo has failed. We all know that we have the opportunity to deliver, and we all know that a vote of “yes” on this budget resolution will give us more tools to deliver that success than we have today. We need to do this. We need to celebrate doing this.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to support the rule and support the two underlying measures that it will bring to the floor.

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Speaker, we are voting on a Budget Resolution later today that makes it possible to take away health coverage from tens of millions of people.

But the Democrats know that this is just the beginning.

Congressional Republicans have started their plans to not just repeal the Affordable Care Act, but to gut Medicare, Medicaid and Social Security.

Republican proposals would threaten nursing home coverage for millions of seniors, undermine comprehensive health care for children by cutting Medicaid, and slash benefits earned after years of hard work.

The CPC and Congressional Democrats will not stand for this. That is why we introduced an amendment that would ensure the Budget Resolution we are voting on today or any future bill can't be used to cut benefits from Social Security, Medicare or Medicaid, increase the retirement age for these benefits, or privatize Social Security.

But, the majority is not allowing debate or a vote on our amendment.

This sends a clear message: Congressional Republicans are willing to put the lives and futures of millions of children, seniors and working families at risk.

It also puts them on the wrong side of history. Cutting Medicare, Medicaid and Social Security is not what the American people want.

President-elect Trump has promised several times that he will not support cuts to these important programs that help millions of Americans make ends meet.

This leaves Congressional Republicans in a tough spot. Whose side are they on?

Will they commit to protecting hard-working Americans? Will they protect America's children? Seniors? What about people with disabilities?

Or, will they yet again cut the benefits of working people so they can give tax breaks to big corporations?

The Congressional Progressive Caucus and House Democrats will not back down. We will oppose any cuts to Medicare, Medicaid, and Social Security.

I urge my colleagues to vote no and defeat the previous question so we can bring up the CPC amendment to block the House GOP from cutting Medicare, Medicaid and Social Security.

Will House Republicans stand with us?

Today, 55 million older people and people with disabilities have health care because of Medicare.

82 percent of Americans—including 74 percent of Republicans, 88 percent of Democrats

and 83 percent of independents—agree it is critical to preserve Social Security for future generations even if it means increasing Social Security taxes paid by working Americans.

In 2015, 11 million Americans became newly eligible for Medicaid thanks to Medicaid expansion.

If Republicans repeal the ACA, at least 11 million people's Medicaid coverage will be at risk.

The House Republican budget plan for fiscal year 2017 would have cut federal Medicaid funding by \$1 trillion—or nearly 25 percent—over ten years. That is in addition to ending Medicaid expansion.

The Urban Institute estimated that the 2012 Ryan proposal would lead states to drop between 14.3 million and 20.5 million people from Medicaid by the tenth year, in addition to the effects of repealing health reform's Medicaid expansion.

The material previously referred to by Mr. MCGOVERN is as follows:

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 48 OFFERED BY  
Mr. MCGOVERN

At the end of the resolution, add the following new sections:

SEC. 3. Notwithstanding any other provision of this resolution, following general debate on Senate Concurrent Resolution 3 and prior to consideration of the amendment printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution, the amendment specified in section 4 shall be in order if offered by Representative Pocan of Wisconsin or a designee. Such amendment shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for 10 minutes equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against such amendment are waived.

SEC. 4. The amendment referred to in section 3 is as follows:

At the end of the concurrent resolution, add the following:

SEC. \_\_\_\_ POINT OF ORDER AGAINST LEGISLATION THAT WOULD BREAK DONALD TRUMP'S PROMISE NOT TO CUT SOCIAL SECURITY, MEDICARE, OR MEDICAID.

(a) POINT OF ORDER.—It shall not be in order in the House of Representatives or the Senate to consider any bill, joint resolution, motion, amendment, amendment between the Houses, or conference report that would—

(1) result in a reduction of guaranteed benefits scheduled under title II of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 401 et seq.);

(2) increase either the early or full retirement age for the benefits described in paragraph (1);

(3) privatize Social Security;

(4) result in a reduction of guaranteed benefits for individuals entitled to, or enrolled for, benefits under the Medicare program under title XVIII of 18 such Act (42 U.S.C. 1395 et seq.); or

(5) result in a reduction of benefits or eligibility for individuals enrolled in, or eligible to receive medical assistance through, a State Medicaid plan or waiver under title XIX of such Act (42 U.S.C. 1396 5 et seq.).

(b) WAIVER AND APPEAL IN THE SENATE.—Subsection (a) may be waived or suspended in the Senate only by an affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn. An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under subsection (a).

(c) WAIVER IN THE HOUSE.—It shall not be in order in the House of Representatives to consider a rule or order that waives the application of subsection (a). As disposition of a point of order under this subsection, the Chair shall put the question of consideration with respect to the rule or order, as applicable. The question of consideration shall be debatable for 10 minutes by the Member initiating the point of order and for 10 minutes by an opponent, but shall otherwise be decided without intervening motion except one that the House adjourn.

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT IT REALLY MEANS

This vote, the vote on whether to order the previous question on a special rule, is not merely a procedural vote. A vote against ordering the previous question is a vote against the Republican majority agenda and a vote to allow the Democratic minority to offer an alternative plan. It is a vote about what the House should be debating.

Mr. Clarence Cannon's Precedents of the House of Representatives (VI, 308-311), describes the vote on the previous question on the rule as “a motion to direct or control the consideration of the subject before the House being made by the Member in charge.” To defeat the previous question is to give the opposition a chance to decide the subject before the House. Cannon cites the Speaker's ruling of January 13, 1920, to the effect that “the refusal of the House to sustain the demand for the previous question passes the control of the resolution to the opposition” in order to offer an amendment. On March 15, 1909, a member of the majority party offered a rule resolution. The House defeated the previous question and a member of the opposition rose to a parliamentary inquiry, asking who was entitled to recognition. Speaker Joseph G. Cannon (R-Illinois) said: “The previous question having been refused, the gentleman from New York, Mr. Fitzgerald, who had asked the gentleman to yield to him for an amendment, is entitled to the first recognition.”

The Republican majority may say “the vote on the previous question is simply a vote on whether to proceed to an immediate vote on adopting the resolution . . . [and] has no substantive legislative or policy implications whatsoever.” But that is not what they have always said. Listen to the Republican Leadership Manual on the Legislative Process in the United States House of Representatives, (6th edition, page 135). Here's how the Republicans describe the previous question vote in their own manual: “Although it is generally not possible to amend the rule because the majority Member controlling the time will not yield for the purpose of offering an amendment, the same result may be achieved by voting down the previous question on the rule . . . . When the motion for the previous question is defeated, control of the time passes to the Member who led the opposition to ordering the previous question. That Member, because he then controls the time, may offer an amendment to the rule, or yield for the purpose of amendment.”

In Deschler's Procedure in the U.S. House of Representatives, the subchapter titled “Amending Special Rules” states: “a refusal to order the previous question on such a rule [a special rule reported from the Committee on Rules] opens the resolution to amendment and further debate.” (Chapter 21, section 21.2) Section 21.3 continues: “Upon rejection of the motion for the previous question on a resolution reported from the Committee on Rules, control shifts to the Member leading the opposition to the previous question, who may offer a proper amendment or motion and who controls the time for debate thereon.”



Clearly, the vote on the previous question on a rule does have substantive policy implications. It is one of the only available tools for those who oppose the Republican majority's agenda and allows those with alternative views the opportunity to offer an alternative plan.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, the Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote on the question of adoption of the resolution.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 234, nays 179, not voting 21, as follows:

[Roll No. 55]

YEAS—234

Abraham	Duncan (SC)	LaHood
Aderholt	Duncan (TN)	LaMalfa
Allen	Dunn	Lamborn
Amash	Emmer	Lance
Amodei	Farenthold	Latta
Arrington	Faso	Lewis (MN)
Babin	Ferguson	LoBiondo
Bacon	Fitzpatrick	Long
Banks (IN)	Fleischmann	Loudermilk
Barletta	Flores	Love
Barr	Fortenberry	Lucas
Barton	Fox	Luetkemeyer
Bergman	Franks (AZ)	MacArthur
Beutler	Frelinghuysen	Marchant
Biggs	Gaetz	Marino
Bilirakis	Gallagher	Marshall
Bishop (MI)	Garrett	Massie
Bishop (UT)	Gibbs	Mast
Black	Gohmert	McCarthy
Blackburn	Goodlatte	McCaul
Blum	Gosar	McClintock
Bost	Gowdy	McHenry
Brady (TX)	Granger	McKinley
Brat	Graves (GA)	McMorris
Bridenstine	Graves (LA)	Rodgers
Brooks (AL)	Graves (MO)	McSally
Brooks (IN)	Griffith	Meadows
Buchanan	Grothman	Meehan
Buck	Guthrie	Messer
Bucshon	Harper	Mitchell
Budd	Harris	Moolenaar
Burgess	Hartzler	Mooney (WV)
Byrne	Hensarling	Mullin
Calvert	Hice, Jody B.	Murphy (PA)
Carter (GA)	Higgins (LA)	Newhouse
Carter (TX)	Hill	Noem
Chabot	Holding	Nunes
Chaffetz	Hollingsworth	Olson
Cheney	Hudson	Palazzo
Coffman	Huizenga	Palmer
Cole	Hultgren	Paulsen
Collins (GA)	Hunter	Pearce
Collins (NY)	Hurd	Perry
Comer	Issa	Pittenger
Comstock	Jenkins (KS)	Poe (TX)
Conaway	Jenkins (WV)	Poliquin
Cook	Johnson (LA)	Posey
Costello (PA)	Johnson (OH)	Ratcliffe
Cramer	Johnson, Sam	Reed
Crawford	Jones	Reichert
Culberson	Jordan	Renacci
Curbelo (FL)	Joyce (OH)	Rice (SC)
Davidson	Katko	Roby
Davis, Rodney	Kelly (MS)	Roe (TN)
Denham	Kelly (PA)	Rogers (AL)
Dent	King (IA)	Rogers (KY)
DeSantis	King (NY)	Rohrabacher
DesJarlais	Kinzing	Rokita
Diaz-Balart	Knight	Rooney, Francis
Donovan	Kustoff (TN)	Rooney, Thomas
Duffy	Labrador	J.

Ros-Lehtinen	Smith (NJ)
Roskam	Smith (TX)
Ross	Smucker
Rothfus	Stefanik
Rouzer	Stewart
Royce (CA)	Stivers
Russell	Taylor
Sanford	Tenney
Scalise	Thompson (PA)
Schweikert	Thornberry
Scott, Austin	Tiberi
Sensenbrenner	Tipton
Sessions	Trott
Shimkus	Turner
Shuster	Upton
Simpson	Valadao
Smith (MO)	Wagner
Smith (NE)	Walberg

Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (IA)
Zeldin

NAYS—179

Adams	Fudge
Aguilar	Gabbard
Barragán	Gallego
Bass	Garamendi
Beatty	Gonzalez (TX)
Becerra	Gottheimer
Bera	Green, Al
Beyer	Green, Gene
Bishop (GA)	Grijalva
Blumenauer	Gutiérrez
Blunt Rochester	Hanabusa
Bonamici	Hastings
Boyle, Brendan	Heck
F.	Higgins (NY)
Brady (PA)	Himes
Brown (MD)	Hoyer
Brownley (CA)	Jackson Lee
Bustos	Jayapal
Butterfield	Jeffries
Capuano	Johnson, E. B.
Carbajal	Kaptur
Cárdenas	Kelly (IL)
Carson (IN)	Kennedy
Cartwright	Khanna
Castor (FL)	Kihuen
Castro (TX)	Kildee
Chu, Judy	Kilmer
Cicilline	Kind
Clark (MA)	Krishnamoorthi
Clarke (NY)	Kuster (NH)
Clay	Langevin
Cleaver	Larsen (WA)
Clyburn	Larson (CT)
Cohen	Lawrence
Connolly	Lawson (FL)
Conyers	Lee
Cooper	Levin
Correa	Lewis (GA)
Corroney	Lieu, Ted
Cuellar	Lipinski
Cummings	Loeback
Davis (CA)	Lofgren
Davis, Danny	Lowenthal
DeFazio	Lowe
DeGette	Lujan Grisham,
Delaney	M.
DeLauro	Luján, Ben Ray
DeBene	Lynch
Demings	Maloney,
DeSaulnier	Carolyn B.
Deutsch	Maloney, Sean
Dingell	Matsui
Doggett	McCollum
Doyle, Michael	McEachin
F.	McGovern
Ellison	McNerney
Engel	Meng
Eshoo	Moulton
Españolat	Murphy (FL)
Esty	Nadler
Foster	Napolitano

NOT VOTING—21

Costa	Meeks
Crist	Moore
Crowley	Mulvaney
Evans	Pelosi
Frankel (FL)	Pompeo
Huffman	Price, Tom (GA)
Johnson (GA)	Rush
Keating	Rutherford

Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Halleran
O'Rourke
Pallone
Panetta
Pascarella
Payne
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Rosen
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Soto
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

Messrs. BRADY of Texas, SMITH of New Jersey, and JORDAN changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the previous question was ordered. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 235, noes 188, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 56]

AYES—235

Abraham	Flores	McCarthy
Aderholt	Fortenberry	McCaul
Allen	Fox	McClintock
Amash	Franks (AZ)	McHenry
Amodei	Frelinghuysen	McKinley
Arrington	Gaetz	McMorris
Babin	Gallagher	Rodgers
Bacon	Garrett	McSally
Banks (IN)	Gibbs	Meadows
Barletta	Gohmert	Meehan
Barr	Goodlatte	Messer
Barton	Gosar	Mitchell
Bergman	Gowdy	Moolenaar
Beutler	Granger	Mooney (WV)
Biggs	Graves (GA)	Mullin
Bilirakis	Graves (LA)	Murphy (PA)
Bishop (MI)	Graves (MO)	Newhouse
Bishop (UT)	Griffith	Noem
Black	Grothman	Nunes
Blackburn	Guthrie	Olson
Blum	Harper	Palazzo
Bost	Harris	Palmer
Brady (TX)	Hartzler	Paulsen
Brat	Hensarling	Pearce
Bridenstine	Hice, Jody B.	Perry
Brooks (AL)	Higgins (LA)	Pittenger
Brooks (IN)	Hill	Poe (TX)
Buchanan	Holding	Poliquin
Buck	Hollingsworth	Posey
Bucshon	Hudson	Ratcliffe
Budd	Huizenga	Reed
Burgess	Hultgren	Reichert
Byrne	Hunter	Renacci
Calvert	Hurd	Rice (SC)
Carter (GA)	Issa	Roby
Carter (TX)	Jenkins (KS)	Roe (TN)
Chabot	Jenkins (WV)	Rogers (AL)
Chaffetz	Johnson (LA)	Rogers (KY)
Cheney	Johnson (OH)	Rohrabacher
Coffman	Johnson, Sam	Rokita
Cole	Jones	Rooney, Francis
Collins (GA)	Jordan	Rooney, Thomas
Collins (NY)	Joyce (OH)	J.
Comer	Katko	Ros-Lehtinen
Comstock	Kelly (MS)	Roskam
Conaway	Kelly (PA)	Ross
Cook	King (IA)	Rothfus
Costello (PA)	King (NY)	Rouzer
Cramer	Kinzing	Royce (CA)
Crawford	Knight	Russell
Culberson	Kustoff (TN)	Sanford
Curbelo (FL)	Labrador	Scalise
Davidson	LaHood	Schweikert
Davis, Rodney	LaMalfa	Scott, Austin
Denham	Lamborn	Sensenbrenner
Dent	Lance	Sessions
DeSantis	Latta	Shimkus
DesJarlais	Lewis (MN)	Shuster
Diaz-Balart	LoBiondo	Simpson
Donovan	Long	Smith (MO)
Duffy	Loudermilk	Smith (NE)
Duncan (SC)	Love	Smith (NJ)
Duncan (TN)	Lucas	Smith (TX)
Dunn	Luetkemeyer	Smucker
Emmer	MacArthur	Stefanik
Farenthold	Marchant	Stewart
Faso	Marino	Stivers
Ferguson	Marshall	Taylor
Fitzpatrick	Massie	Tenney
Fleischmann	Mast	Thompson (PA)

Messrs. DOGGETT and CLYBURN changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Thornberry  
Tiberi  
Tipton  
Trott  
Turner  
Upton  
Valadao  
Wagner  
Walberg

Walden  
Walker  
Walorski  
Walters, Mimi  
Weber (TX)  
Webster (FL)  
Wenstrup  
Westerman  
Williams

Wilson (SC)  
Wittman  
Womack  
Woodall  
Yoder  
Yoho  
Young (AK)  
Young (IA)  
Zeldin

# CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2017

## GENERAL LEAVE

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on S. Con. Res. 3.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 48 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the concurrent resolution, S. Con. Res. 3.

The Chair appoints the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HULTGREN) to preside over the Committee of the Whole.

□ 1057

## IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 3) setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2017 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2018 through 2026, with Mr. HULTGREN in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to the rule, the concurrent resolution is considered read the first time.

General debate shall not exceed 2 hours, with 90 minutes confined to the congressional budget, equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Budget, and 30 minutes on the subject of economic goals and policies, equally divided and controlled by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TIBERI) and the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY), or their designees.

The gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACK) and the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. YARMUTH) each will control 45 minutes of debate on the congressional budget.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to inform my colleagues that I intend to reserve 5 minutes of debate time to use after the Joint Economic Committee debate has concluded.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today to speak on behalf of Americans everywhere who are hurting because of ObamaCare. They are calling out for relief from this disastrous law, and Republicans are here today to begin delivering on our promise to provide relief.

We hear plenty of claims from the other side of the aisle during this de-

bate, but let's be clear: ObamaCare has failed and it is only going to get worse.

□ 1100

Patients have seen skyrocketing premiums and deductibles, lost access to the doctors they preferred, had fewer coverage options, while others have had their plans canceled outright. It is no wonder so many people have rejected this law.

In 2015, roughly 8 million Americans paid the ObamaCare penalty, and more than 12 million Americans claimed an exemption from the penalty. That is 20 million Americans. What does that say about this law that 20 million Americans want nothing to do with it, many preferring to pay a penalty rather than to be subjected to its higher costs and fewer choices? If you ask me, it is strong evidence that the American people are tired of paying more and getting less.

Of course, the destruction that ObamaCare has caused extends beyond discouraging individuals to purchase coverage. It has been a direct attack on those who had insurance already.

In my home State of Tennessee, 28,000 people lost coverage on a single day when the CoverTN program lapsed after the Obama administration decreed that it ran afoul of the Federal Government's top-down requirements. Now premiums in our State are rising by an average of 63 percent, and three-quarters of our counties only have one coverage option to choose from on the ObamaCare exchange.

In five other States around the country—Alabama, Alaska, Oklahoma, South Carolina, and Wyoming—patients only have one insurer in the marketplace to choose from. That makes it pretty difficult for someone to find a plan that meets their unique needs or that of their family.

President Obama promised that this law would lower premiums by \$2,500 per year for the average family. The exact opposite has happened. Average family premiums have gone up by \$4,300, and deductibles have gone up by 60 percent. This is hitting hardworking Americans, many of whom are already struggling to make ends meet.

Folks in Tennessee and all across the country are spending more and more money on their health insurance because of ObamaCare, when they would rather be saving for a new house or for their children's college. The last thing working men and women need right now is the Federal Government making their life harder with more expensive health insurance by continuing to support this failed law.

That is why we are here today. The Senate successfully passed this resolution yesterday, and now it is time for the House to deliver on our promise, by kick-starting the reconciliation process so that we can repeal ObamaCare and provide relief for the folks who are hurting because of this law.

While our friends on the other side of the aisle always claim that Republicans have no ideas or no plans to replace ObamaCare, that simply isn't

## NOES—188

Adams  
Aguilar  
Barragán  
Bass  
Beatty  
Becerra  
Bera  
Beyer  
Bishop (GA)  
Blumenauer  
Blunt Rochester  
Bonamici  
Boyle, Brendan  
F.  
Brady (PA)  
Brown (MD)  
Brownley (CA)  
Bustos  
Butterfield  
Capuano  
Carbajal  
Cárdenas  
Carson (IN)  
Cartwright  
Castor (FL)  
Castro (TX)  
Chu, Judy  
Cicilline  
Clark (MA)  
Clarke (NY)  
Clay  
Clever  
Clyburn  
Cohen  
Connolly  
Conyers  
Cooper  
Correa  
Costa  
Courtney  
Crist  
Cuellar  
Cummings  
Davis (CA)  
Davis, Danny  
DeFazio  
DeGette  
Delaney  
DeLauro  
DelBene  
Demings  
DeSaulnier  
Deutch  
Dingell  
Doggett  
Doyle, Michael  
F.  
Ellison  
Engel  
Eshoo  
Español  
Esty  
Evans  
Foster  
Fudge

Gabbard  
Gallego  
Garamendi  
Gonzalez (TX)  
Gottheimer  
Green, Al  
Green, Gene  
Grijaiva  
Gutiérrez  
Hanabusa  
Hastings  
Heck  
Higgins (NY)  
Himes  
Hoyer  
Jackson Lee  
Jayapal  
Jeffries  
Johnson (GA)  
Johnson, E. B.  
Kaptur  
Keating  
Kelly (IL)  
Kennedy  
Khanna  
Kihuen  
Kildee  
Kilmer  
Kind  
Krishnamoorthi  
Kuster (NH)  
Langevin  
Larsen (WA)  
Larson (CT)  
Lawrence  
Lawson (FL)  
Lee  
Levin  
Lewis (GA)  
Lieu, Ted  
Lipinski  
Loebach  
Lofgren  
Lowenthal  
Lowe  
Lujan Grisham,  
M.  
Luján, Ben Ray  
Lynch  
Maloney,  
Carolyn B.  
Maloney, Sean  
Matsui  
McCollum  
McEachin  
McGovern  
McNerney  
Meeks  
Meng  
Moore  
Moulton  
Murphy (FL)  
Nadler  
Napolitano  
Neal

Nolan  
Norcross  
O'Halleran  
O'Rourke  
Pallone  
Panetta  
Pascarelli  
Payne  
Perlmutter  
Peters  
Peterson  
Pingree  
Pocan  
Polis  
Price (NC)  
Quigley  
Raskin  
Rice (NY)  
Richmond  
Rosen  
Roybal-Allard  
Ruiz  
Ruppersberger  
Ryan (OH)  
Sánchez  
Sarbanes  
Schakowsky  
Schiff  
Schneider  
Schradner  
Scott (VA)  
Scott, David  
Serrano  
Sewell (AL)  
Shea-Porter  
Sherman  
Sinema  
Sires  
Slaughter  
Smith (WA)  
Soto  
Speier  
Swalwell (CA)  
Takano  
Thompson (CA)  
Thompson (MS)  
Titus  
Tonko  
Torres  
Tsongas  
Vargas  
Veasey  
Vela  
Velázquez  
Visclosky  
Walz  
Wasserman  
Schultz  
Waters, Maxine  
Watson Coleman  
Welch  
Wilson (FL)  
Yarmuth

## NOT VOTING—11

Crowley  
Frankel (FL)  
Huffman  
Mulvaney

Pelosi  
Pompeo  
Price, Tom (GA)  
Rush

Rutherford  
Suozi  
Zinke

□ 1053

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. SUOZZI. Mr. Speaker, I was not able to vote during the following rollcall votes. Had I been present, I would have voted in the following manner. On vote roll No. 55, I would have voted "nay." On vote roll No. 56, I would have voted "nay."

true, and they know it. I have with me here today a few examples, including A Better Way, the 37-page proposal that will provide access to care for all Americans and increase choice and competition.

I would like to also reference that PETE SESSIONS has a healthcare bill that he has filed. The RSC, with PHIL ROE, has a replacement bill that has been filed. PAUL RYAN filed a bill right after the passage of ObamaCare. We also have TOM PRICE's replacement bill that is here. All of these documents are here and available for people to look at and to also find online, as well as A Better Way that we have put out from our Conference.

I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on this resolution to begin the process of repealing ObamaCare and paving the way for patient-centered reforms.

Mr. Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I would like to remind my colleague that her vote today to repeal the Affordable Care Act will result in 266,000 people from her State of Tennessee losing their healthcare coverage, 57,000 workers losing their jobs, and an economic loss of \$34.2 billion in gross State product for the State of Tennessee over 5 years.

The so-called budget before us was drafted by Republicans for the sole purpose of repealing the Affordable Care Act and defunding Planned Parenthood by a simple majority in the Senate. It squanders the opportunity to start this new Congress working together to address the concerns and priorities of the American people in a constructive and bipartisan manner.

The Affordable Care Act is making an incredible difference across my home State of Kentucky, as in many other places. With our expansion of Medicaid and the success of our State marketplace, Kynect, more than half a million Kentuckians in a State of 4 million have gained quality, affordable coverage. In Louisville alone, the uninsured rate dropped 81 percent.

In a State with tremendous health needs, we are a national model of ACA success. Even our Republican Senator, RAND PAUL, and our Republican Governor, Matt Bevin, who are vehemently opposed to the law, know we can't go back to where we were before the ACA. They now acknowledge that Republicans in Congress should not repeal the Affordable Care Act without immediately replacing it.

Much of the debate about the ACA focuses on the 20 million newly insured individuals, but the law has done much more than that. Millions of seniors on Medicare have saved on prescription drug coverage. For people on their employer's plan, out-of-pocket costs are capped, and lifetime limits are gone. If you are one of the 129 million Americans with a preexisting condition, you currently have the peace of mind of

knowing that you can always get coverage if you lose your job, change your job, or start your own business.

Let me tell you about Steve Riggert, my constituent who recently wrote to me. When Steve's daughter Anna was 12, she was diagnosed with chronic pancreatitis, a rare disease for a child. This is Anna. Over the next 3 years, she was hospitalized 15 times. Despite their best efforts and prayers, transplant surgery did not achieve success. She has struggled with diabetes and complications. At age 22, she has been hospitalized 26 times for various reasons.

From the beginning, Steve knew that Anna's preexisting condition would make getting medical coverage difficult. So far, he has been able to cover her medical bills through his employer plan. When the ACA was passed, he was immensely relieved that Anna could always get coverage even though she has had a serious preexisting medical condition.

But the Republican plan to repeal the ACA has now left Steve feeling—and these are his words—helpless, petrified, and, literally, losing sleep. At age 64 and recently diagnosed with pancreatic cancer, he fears for how much he can support her. To quote his letter: "Repeal of all aspects of the Affordable Care Act would place everything I have worked for and those I care about in jeopardy."

Mr. Chairman, I am here today to fight for Steve, for Anna, and for all the Americans across the country who are begging you not to take away their health care. Repealing the Affordable Care Act without a replacement will cause chaos. Nearly 30 million people would lose coverage, including more than 4 million kids. Any consumers left in the individual market are likely to face higher premiums and fewer choices as insurers exit the system.

It has been nearly 7 years since the Affordable Care Act was signed into law, and Republicans still do not have a viable plan to replace it, period. Republican Conference Chair CATHY MCMORRIS RODGERS said this week that the Republican replacement plan will guarantee "no one who has coverage today because of ObamaCare will lose that coverage."

We are waiting for that plan because none of the bills Republicans will wave from that podium today meet that standard or has the support of the majority of their Conference. Democrats offered a number of amendments to this budget to protect the ACA and make it reflect the priorities of American families. We owe the millions of people who are deeply concerned about this process nothing less. Unfortunately, Republicans refuse to allow a vote on a single one.

Putting American families and our Nation's healthcare system at risk is irresponsible. I, therefore, urge my colleagues to oppose the Republican budget. The American people deserve better. Anna deserves better. Her father and her family deserve better.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROKITA), one of my classmates and also the vice chair of the Committee on the Budget.

Mr. ROKITA. Mr. Chair, I thank the chairwoman for yielding the time. It is a pleasure to continue our work together on this very important issue.

It has taken us 6 years to get to today, the first real step in repealing what is one of the most insidious laws that ever came out of these Chambers—insidious because it was built on lies. Remember "You can keep your doctor if you want to," "You can keep your plan if you want to"? Lies. Remember when premiums were to go down because this, of course, Mr. Chairman, was the Affordable Care Act? Lies.

The gentleman from Kentucky made some assertions just a while ago. I want to take a look at the State of Kentucky itself. Four plans left the ObamaCare exchange at the end of 2016 in the State of Kentucky. Of the remaining plans, each increased their premiums by double digits: 22.9 percent, 29.3 percent, and 33.7 percent, respectively, for 2017. And Kentucky's exchange enrollment decreased by 12 percent.

How, Mr. Chairman, is this helping people?

Look, if we didn't care about people, we could stand by and watch this failed plan, this insidious law continue to implode, continue to hurt people. Instead, we stand here ready to erase the foundation that this law was based on and put forth a better one, one that doesn't leave anyone behind, one that is based on market-driven, consumer-driven, patient-driven needs and expectations and allows them to, for example, keep their job.

What do I mean by that, Mr. Chairman? Consider this. Not only do we have bad healthcare outcomes as a result of this insidious law, people are losing work. They are being robbed of their dignity to work. Since ObamaCare, 21 percent of businesses are reducing the number of employees, their wages and salaries and their benefits, including their retirement benefits.

So this insidious law is not only having detrimental implications on our health care and people's health, but it is taking away the very dignity that they have to work.

It is also spelling the death of health savings accounts, proven over the last several years to be part of the solution to consumer-driven health care. The idea that you can save for your healthcare expenses, with or without the government's help, so that you can make value decisions as to your health care without government interference. It leads to better patient outcomes. It leads to freedom to make healthcare decisions absent the oversight of the government. ObamaCare all but outlawed health savings accounts. I think

health savings accounts are probably in every one of those different plans the chairwoman pointed out.

So we are offering a replacement. We are offering solutions. We are offering a better way.

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank my colleague for the shout-out to Kentucky. He neglected to mention that our Governor, Republican Governor, who was elected in 2015 has done virtually everything he could over the last year to sabotage the Affordable Care Act, including dismantling our incredibly successful Kynect exchange, and that is one of the reasons why some of the enrollments declined, because he has made it harder for people to enroll.

I would remind my friend, also, that his vote today to repeal the Affordable Care Act will result in 339,000 people from his State of Indiana losing their healthcare coverage, 55,000 workers losing their jobs, and an economic loss of \$30.4 billion in gross State product over 5 years in Indiana.

I now yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GENE GREEN) for a unanimous consent request.

(Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I oppose the Republican resolution and support the Democratic resolution. We shouldn't deal with affordable care without a solution. Just don't repeal. Let's see what the replacement is so we don't, as Kentucky would say, buy a pig in a poke.

Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to S. Con. Res. 3, the FY 2017 Budget Resolution, the next step in the process of repealing essential coverage and patient protections established by the Affordable Care Act.

Moving forward with implementing the GOP's devastating ACA repeal plan will lead to massive losses of coverage and consumer protections for people enrolled in insurance and in the Medicaid program.

It will hamper the movement towards value-based payment reforms, burden seniors with higher out-of-pocket costs on their prescription drugs, and undermine prevention and wellness initiatives.

Repealing the ACA will leave every state with big increases in the uninsured rate and higher uncompensated care costs, and threatens coverage for people with pre-existing conditions.

Charging forward without even agreeing on a replacement plan is a blatant abdication of the responsibilities we have as representatives of the American people.

The effects of doing so are not abstract. People are going to get hurt in very real ways.

The American people deserve to know how Republicans plan to avoid the devastating consequences of ACA repeal, which include millions losing coverage, chaos in the insurance markets, hospitals and states losing billions of dollars and a hit to our economy.

In addition, the FY17 Budget Resolution shamelessly prioritizes politics over patients by proposing to defund Planned Parenthood.

Denying patients the quality care—including breast exams, contraception, and preventive

and primary care services—will only exacerbate the pain felt from coverage losses for the 2.5 million patients who depend on Planned Parenthood each year for care.

The Resolution is bad for patients, budgets, and will upend our health care system.

It fails the test of sensible policymaking.

The lack of any details on the ACA replacement Republicans say they will enact fails the test of sensible policymaking: having the key information before voting.

We should be taking steps to amend, not upend, the law.

I urge my colleagues to abandon this collision course and stop working against the American people.

We should not be "Making America Sick Again."

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Washington (Ms. DELBENE), a distinguished member of the Committee on the Budget.

Ms. DELBENE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to this reckless budget resolution. Congress had an opportunity to start on a bipartisan note, to work on creating jobs, building an economy that works for everyone, and investing in our infrastructure. Instead, House Republicans are ringing in the new year by repealing the Affordable Care Act, stripping more than 20 million people of their health insurance. What is worse, there is still no plan for what comes next, threatening massive disruption to the entire healthcare system.

I offered a number of amendments to this legislation, none of which were allowed a vote today. My amendments would have stopped this dangerous process from moving forward if the Republican budget reduces access to treatment for those suffering from addiction, reduces access to health care in rural areas, forces seniors to pay more for care, or privatizes Medicare. I also cosponsored an amendment by Congresswoman LEE to protect women's access to reproductive health and family planning services.

□ 1115

Apparently, the majority is not concerned with these issues. Before the ACA, the situation was unacceptable. It was a time when people went bankrupt because they got sick, when individuals with preexisting medical conditions found it virtually impossible to obtain affordable coverage.

But now, more than 120 million Americans with preexisting conditions are no longer denied coverage, and young adults can stay on their parents' plans until they are 26.

Over 10 million seniors have received help with their prescription drug payments, and all insurance plans are required to cover preventative services with no copayments.

Rather than focusing on common-sense reforms to strengthen the ACA, Republicans want to eliminate vital lifesaving policy with no plan for what comes next. I strongly urge a "no" vote.

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Chairman, it is my pleasure to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. JOHNSON), one of my classmates from the 2010 class, and a member of the Budget Committee.

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Mr. Chair, it is amazing to me now that some of our colleagues on the other side of the aisle are calling to see the replacement before the repeal. What irony that is when—at that time the Speaker—the leader of their party, said: let's pass this law so we can see what is in it.

Well, the American people saw what is in it, and they don't like it. It is broken. It needs to be fixed.

The American people deserve a stable transition to a patient-centered healthcare system that gives them access to high-quality, affordable health care.

It has got to be done thoughtfully and carefully as it will impact millions—because I agree with my colleagues that it is going to impact millions. But it is going to positively impact millions if we do it right. And we will.

The only way to accomplish it in this current environment, the only way to accomplish the repeal of ObamaCare, is through the budget reconciliation process. And so this budget resolution that we are going to be considering today is simply a requirement, the triggering mechanism for the reconciliation process.

We are going to get to the fiscal year 2018 budget, a budget that balances, a budget that puts us on a path of fiscal sustainability, but this resolution essentially fires the starting pistol, Mr. Chairman, for repeal of ObamaCare, which has failed the American people.

We will be addressing the spending levels for the future in the fiscal year 2018 budget. This is something the American people have demanded, and now Republicans are going to deliver on it.

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Chairman, I remind my colleague that his vote today to repeal the Affordable Care Act will result in 664,000 people from his State of Ohio losing their healthcare coverage; 126,000 workers losing their jobs; and an economic loss of \$69.5 billion in gross State product for the State of Ohio. Ohio's Republican Governor is begging us not to repeal the Affordable Care Act.

Mr. Chairman, I now yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY), a distinguished member of the Education and the Workforce Committee.

Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY. Mr. Chairman, I am Congressman RAJA KRISHNAMOORTHY, and I represent the hardworking families of Chicago's west and northwest suburbs.

I rise today in strong opposition to S. Con. Res. 3.

Repealing without replacing the Affordable Care Act at the same time would devastate our economy and harm millions of middle class families.

Within the Eighth District of Illinois alone, we could lose upwards of \$550 million from our economy, and over 4,000 jobs.

Before joining Congress, I ran small businesses in the Chicago area in the national security and technology sectors. I know firsthand how important health coverage is to our workers and to our businesses. Without the protections of the ACA, we will see fewer entrepreneurs take the risk of starting a business and fewer workers taking the risk of working for a startup.

Middle class and working families need good-paying jobs and affordable health care. And, unfortunately, the bill before us today would rob them of both.

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Chairman, I do want to make reference to Ranking Member YARMUTH's information on the Commonwealth fund. I want to note that that report that was reported out does not take into account that Republicans do have a plan. It also does not take into account that the repeal of the taxes would put money back into the economy and boost the economy.

I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. LEWIS), a freshman and one of the newest members of the Budget Committee.

Mr. LEWIS of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, today, I join many of my colleagues in taking the first steps to repeal and replace ObamaCare.

My home State of Minnesota has been hit especially hard by this law. Minnesotans have seen their health insurance choices shrink, while their premiums, copays, and deductibles skyrocket. I should know.

For the last, in fact, over 5 years, I have been in the individual market and my own insurance premiums have nearly tripled, and I have gone through three insurers.

Minnesotans have seen a 50 to 67 percent increase in the premium costs this year alone. That is the fourth highest increase in the country.

As Democratic Governor Mark Dayton of Minnesota stated: "... the Affordable Care Act is no longer affordable. . . ."

In fact, politicians in Minnesota are looking for waivers from the Affordable Care Act; not more of it. The other side likes to talk about healthcare access. Mr. Chairman, I would argue that the single biggest obstacle to healthcare access right now is the Affordable Care Act. It is not sustainable.

It is time to repeal this failed legislation and replace it with meaningful reforms that empower consumers, expand choice, and increase affordability.

I urge my colleagues to support this resolution, so all Minnesotans and all Americans can have access to affordable and portable health care.

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Chairman, I remind my colleague that his vote today to repeal the Affordable Care Act will result in 250,000 people from his State of Minnesota losing their healthcare

coverage; 53,000 workers losing their jobs; and an economic loss of \$32.9 billion in gross State product over 5 years.

Mr. Chairman, it now gives me great pleasure to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMPSON), a distinguished member of the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to repeal of the Affordable Care Act.

For 7 years, all we have heard from the Republicans regarding health care is repeal and replace.

After 7 years and more than 60 votes, they still have not come up with the replace. This isn't just a talking point. This is literally a matter of life and death for people.

Raymond, from Napa in my district, was diagnosed with stage III renal cancer in 1996. His premiums rose year after year until we passed the ACA.

Before the ACA, Raymond worried about losing his insurance because of his preexisting condition. In fact, his cancer returned in 2014, but, thanks to the ACA, he got the treatment he needed.

What are Republicans going to do for Raymond if they repeal the ACA and his premiums go up, or his insurance drops him because he had cancer over 20 years ago, or he hits his lifetime cap on coverage?

Republicans need to ask themselves if they are willing to return Americans like Raymond to a time when the care they needed was always beyond their grasp.

I am not saying that it is perfect, but we need to keep it. It also kills 3 million jobs.

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Chairman, it is my distinct honor to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. SCALISE), our House whip.

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Chair, I thank the gentlewoman from Tennessee for bringing this budget resolution to the floor.

Mr. Chairman, ObamaCare has failed the American people. And if you go back to the beginning, it was created with a series of lies to the American people. We all remember: if you like what you have, you can keep it. How has that worked out for millions of Americans who lost the plans that they liked and now cannot keep that plan?

What about the promise, Mr. Chairman, that premiums would go down by \$2,500? President Obama made that claim. And today, in States all across the Nation, you are seeing premiums go up, on average, 25 percent, and that is on top of double-digit increases every single year ObamaCare has been in effect.

This law is not working. It is failing families. It is costing jobs across our economy. It is time to repeal this law and actually replace it with reforms that put patients back in charge of their medical decisions with their doctors. What a great concept that would be.

It is about time we focus on lowering the cost of health care and giving peo-

ple real choices. In so many markets across the country—and it is a growing number—families have only one choice for health care now because ObamaCare has forced so many people out of the marketplace, which means you as a family don't have any choices, because one choice means it is a monopoly. And you wonder why the costs are skyrocketing.

Mr. Chairman, this should not be about preserving somebody's legacy. It should be about fulfilling those promises to the American people that were broken. And we are here to fulfill that promise—how refreshing it is that you have people that ran for years saying we are going to repeal ObamaCare—with a President who is ready to sign the bill to repeal ObamaCare.

Today, just in the second week of this new Congress, we are taking the first step to fulfill that promise to the American people, to put their healthcare decisions back in their hands with costs that they can afford, and real choices that work for all Americans.

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Chairman, I will remind my colleague that his vote today to repeal the Affordable Care Act will result in 269,000 people from his State of Louisiana losing their healthcare coverage; 37,000 workers losing their jobs; and an economic loss of \$21.5 billion in gross State product over 5 years for the State of Louisiana.

Mr. Chairman, I now yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from New Mexico (Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM), a distinguished member of the Budget Committee.

Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico. Mr. Chair, I can tell you who is happy that the budget resolution will likely pass the House today, Big Pharma. Pharmaceutical companies are once again escaping any changes to a system which has repeatedly allowed them to prioritize profits over people and drive increases in out-of-pocket healthcare costs.

Companies like Mylan, Turing, and Valeant are jacking up lifesaving drugs like EpiPen for anaphylactic shock; Daraprim for HIV and cancer patients; and Nitropress for heart failure overnight without any accountability.

While the American people increasingly can't afford their medicine, pharmaceutical companies are the wealthiest they have been in years.

In fact, median healthcare and pharmaceutical executive pay is higher than any other industry in the United States.

And even though taxpayers fund billions of dollars of basic medical research used to develop groundbreaking drugs, pharmaceutical companies often charge Americans many times what the rest of the world pays.

Mr. Chair, Americans can't afford to continue giving pharmaceutical and health insurance executives a pay raise, and many on both sides of the aisle agree.

Just this week, President-elect Donald Trump added his voice to that effort saying: pharma was "getting away

with murder.” I agree. They are literally getting away with murder. Because if a mother can’t afford her child’s EpiPen, or a cancer patient can’t afford treatment, people die.

So I offered an amendment to this budget resolution seeking to lower prescription drug costs, but Republicans refuse to even allow debate on my amendment.

Instead of fighting to make sure Americans have access to lifesaving medications, Republicans are protecting the ability of pharmaceutical companies to continue to shake down the American people.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this resolution and, instead, address these healthcare costs and access issues that every American knows too well.

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Chairman, it is my honor to yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX), who is the chairman of the Education and the Workforce Committee.

□ 1130

Ms. FOXX. I thank my colleague from Tennessee for yielding time.

Mr. Chairman, today, we take the next step in the process of providing the American people a better way on health care. We have all heard from constituents and families who are struggling to get by as they suffer the consequences of the fatally flawed healthcare law.

In my home State of North Carolina, the average ObamaCare premium has increased by a staggering 40 percent. Terry from Advance, North Carolina, is a 70-year-old retiree, but now he is working part time just to help pay for his wife’s healthcare premiums, which jumped from \$300 a month to more than \$887 a month.

On top of higher premiums, deductibles have skyrocketed, too. Patricia from Kernersville now has a whopping \$6,550 deductible, and her premiums increased by 80 percent this year. Like so many Americans, Patricia is paying more for less coverage.

Despite being promised, “if you like your healthcare plan, you can keep it,” millions of Americans have been kicked off their plans. Scott from Hickory has had his health insurance canceled three times now; disrupting his continuity of care.

We have also heard from countless small-business owners who can no longer afford coverage for their employees because of limited resources and soaring costs. Facing similar challenges, school leaders and college administrators have spoken out about how ObamaCare is exacerbating tight budgets—hurting teachers, faculty members, and, ultimately, the students they serve.

The current situation is not sustainable; so Republicans are here on a rescue mission by providing the American people relief. It is time to repeal President Obama’s government takeover of health care. It is time to advance pa-

tient-centered reforms that lower costs, provide more choices, and put working families—not government bureaucrats—in control of their health care.

I urge my colleagues to support this budget resolution because it will move us one step closer to the patient-centered health care the American people desperately want and need.

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Chairman, I will remind the gentlewoman that her vote today to repeal the Affordable Care Act will result in 552,000 people from her State of North Carolina losing their healthcare coverage, 76,000 workers losing their jobs, and an economic loss of \$39.4 billion in gross State product, over 5 years, for North Carolina.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Oregon (Ms. BONAMICI), a distinguished member of the Education and the Workforce Committee.

Ms. BONAMICI. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this budget resolution. The Affordable Care Act saves lives.

Today I want to talk about Mark Rouska from Tualatin, Oregon. Mark was diagnosed with stage IV renal cancer, and doctors told him the cancer had metastasized to his lungs. He had to resign from a job he loved as a special education teacher. Without chemotherapy, he would probably not be alive. That treatment costs about \$20,000 a month, but because he has insurance through the Affordable Care Act, Mark pays about \$175 a month. At the end of this month, Mark and his wife, Patrice, will celebrate their 31st anniversary.

Repealing the Affordable Care Act will endanger health coverage for millions of people. One of them is Mark. I will do everything in my power to protect the many Oregonians who rely on the Affordable Care Act. I urge my colleagues to oppose this resolution.

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. GROTHMAN), who is also a member of our Budget Committee.

Mr. GROTHMAN. I thank the gentlewoman.

Mr. Chairman, it is not a surprise, when you try to take over such a sizable chunk of America’s economy, that you have all sorts of unintended bad consequences. I am going to focus on two consequences that are true of so many programs that the government puts out there.

First of all, ObamaCare is one more program that discourages work. If you talk to your accountants again and again, they will tell you stories of people who are very conscious of the fact that, as they get a raise, as they work more overtime, they lose big subsidies. If I were to lose my next election, ObamaCare would continue. As my income would go up from \$49,000 to \$50,000, I would get hammered with a \$4,500 loss. So it wouldn’t be surprising that people in my position would be very careful not to get a raise or not to work overtime.

Even worse, this is one more government program that discourages marriage. If you have a single parent who is making \$20,000 and if he decided to marry somebody making \$30,000 or \$40,000, he would be hammered with a \$3,500 loss. Combined with the FoodShare program, the low-income housing subsidies, Pell grants, and various TANF programs, this is just one more step that the American Government has taken to discourage work and to discourage marriage.

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Chairman, I will remind the gentleman that his vote today to repeal the Affordable Care Act will result in 211,000 people from his State of Wisconsin losing their healthcare coverage, 46,000 workers losing their jobs, and an economic loss of \$25.7 billion in gross State product, over 5 years, for the State of Wisconsin.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE), a distinguished member of the Judiciary Committee.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. I thank the distinguished gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, I stand in opposition to this reckless, irresponsible, heartless, and bare bones Republican budget resolution because it does nothing to provide jobs for the American workers; it does nothing to invest in the roads, bridges, ports, cyber networks, and other infrastructure that is needed to sustain economic growth; it explodes the deficit and enriches those who are already wealthy at the expense of middle and working class families.

In particular, this foolish rush to repeal the Affordable Care Act makes plain for all to see that congressional Republicans are far more interested in scoring political points with their rightwing base than they are in protecting the health and economic security of American families.

Thirty million people will lose their insurance; the insurance market will be in shambles; and families left behind will have higher premiums. We will close rural hospitals; and hospitals will lose billions of dollars and might reduce services and cut jobs. The economy will lose 2.6 million jobs.

Repeal and replace is just a straw man. It is about real lives, like Pamela Gross, who suffers from chronic lupus and a number of other autoimmune disorders that have required her to spend upwards of \$5,000.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. YARMUTH. I yield the gentlewoman an additional 15 seconds.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. I thank the gentleman.

She writes: “I asked my doctor recently, ‘With all that’s going on, would I make it without treatment?’ The doctor’s answer: ‘No.’”

In her instance, if the Affordable Care Act goes—if it is repealed—she could completely lose her eligibility for expanded Medicaid and simply die. A young man in my district would die as well.



This is a bad bill. Vote against it. Save America's good health.

Mr. Chair, I rise today in strong opposition to S. Con. Res. 3, the Congressional Budget Resolution for Fiscal Year 2017, which more appropriately should be known as the "Make America Sick Again" Budget.

I stand in opposition to this reckless, irresponsible, heartless, and bare-bones Republican budget resolution because it does nothing to provide jobs for American workers; does nothing to invest in the roads, bridges, ports, cybernetworks, and other infrastructure needed to sustain economic growth; and explodes the deficit and enriches those who are already wealthy at the expense of middle and working-class families.

Let us be very clear about the real objective of our Republican colleagues: their sole purpose in bringing this resolution to the floor is to pave the way for the repeal of the Affordable Care Act and the defunding of Planned Parenthood by a simple majority vote in the Senate.

This foolish rush to repeal the Affordable Care Act makes plain for all to see that congressional Republicans are far more interested in scoring political points with their right-wing base than they are in protecting the health and economic security of American families.

Mr. Chair, the Affordable Care Act has been an undisputed success, making access to quality affordable healthcare available to more than 20 million Americans who previously lived with the dreaded fear that an unexpected injury or illness to them or a family member would go untreated or could bankrupt their families.

While House Republicans may pine for a return to those bad old days, the large majority of Americans do not because they understand that repeal of the Affordable Care Act will have devastating consequences for working families, women, and the economy.

Mr. Chair, health care experts, governors, and hospitals warn that repealing the ACA without a comprehensive plan in its place will cause chaos and catastrophe, including:

1. Nearly 30 million people would lose health care coverage, including more than 4 million kids;

2. With the individual insurance market in shambles, families remaining in what's left of it could face higher premiums and fewer choices as insurers exit;

3. Hospitals would lose billions of dollars and might reduce services or cut jobs; and rural hospitals would close.

4. The economy would lose 2.6 million jobs in 2019, with the majority in non-health sectors.

Additionally, eliminating Medicaid funding to Planned Parenthood would severely restrict women's access to comprehensive care such as contraception, cancer screenings, and STI tests and treatments.

Mr. Chair, Republicans claim they have a replacement plan for the Affordable Care Act but the truth is they do not have a plan now nor have they in the past nor will they in the future.

"Repeal and Replace" is an empty slogan and is about as serious as the President-Elect's promise of "something terrific."

Republicans have had seven years to produce and coalesce around an alternative to the ACA, and they totally failed.

The reason for their failure is they are afflicted with Obama Derangement Syndrome

that blinds them to the ACA's substantial and positive improvements in people's lives.

Without the ACA, insurance companies could continue to make their own rules, and deny coverage based on a person's health status or job, offer lousy benefits, and impose annual and lifetime limits.

Without the ACA, seniors would still face the Part D donut hole and have to pay more for drugs, and parents would not be able to keep their kids on their plan until age 26.

Without the ACA, 20 million people would not have gained coverage, and we would not have the lowest uninsured rate on record.

If Republicans really thought they could match this record of success, they would have unveiled and campaigned on their alternative plan in the last election or at least reveal it to the American people right now.

It is immoral to put families, the health care system, or our economy at risk by repealing the ACA, hurting the economy, ballooning the deficit, and giving hundreds of billions of dollars in tax cuts to corporations and the wealthy.

Mr. Chair, the constituents of the 18th Congressional District of Texas, which I am privileged to represent, are not buying the 'Repeal and Replace' bill of goods that Republicans are selling because they know the Affordable Care Act, which they lovingly call ObamaCare, has brought peace of mind and security where before there was only worry and fear.

Here are some of the ways the Affordable Care Act has made a positive difference to the residents of my congressional district:

1. Coverage for the Previously Uninsured.

Up to 193,000 individuals in the district who lack health insurance will have access to quality, affordable coverage without fear of discrimination or higher rates because of a pre-existing health condition.

2. Tax Credits to Make Insurance Affordable.

Under the ACA, tax credits are available to assist individuals and families purchase the private health insurance they need.

The amount of these tax credits range from \$630 to \$4,480 for individuals and from \$3,550 to \$11,430 for a family of four.

This benefits as many as 446,850 constituents in my congressional district.

3. Extra Benefits for Seniors.

More than 4,100 seniors in my district receive prescription drug discounts worth an average of \$828 per person.

4. Extended Coverage for Young Adults.

11,400 young adults in the district now have health insurance through their parents' plan.

5. No Exorbitant Out-of-Pocket Expenses, Deductibles or Co-Pays.

121,000 individuals in my district—including 23,000 children and 50,000 women—now have health insurance that covers preventive services without any co-pays, coinsurance, or deductible.

6. Premium Rebates.

113,000 individuals in my district are saving money due to ACA provisions that prevent insurance companies from spending more than 20% of their premiums on profits and administrative overhead.

7. No Discrimination for Pre-Existing Conditions.

In my district, up to 46,000 children with preexisting health conditions no longer can be denied coverage by health insurers.

8. No Annual or Lifetime Caps on Coverage.

153,000 individuals in my district now have insurance that cannot place lifetime limits on their coverage and no long face annual limits on coverage.

It is said often, Mr. Chair, but is no less true, that the federal budget is more than a financial document; it is an expression of the nation's most cherished values.

As the late and great former senator and Vice-President Hubert Humphrey said:

The moral test of government is how that government treats those who are in the dawn of life, the children; those who are in the twilight of life, the elderly; and those who are in shadows of life, the sick, the needy, and the handicapped.

It is for this reason that in evaluating the merits of a budget resolution, it is not enough to subject it only to the test of fiscal responsibility.

To keep faith with the nation's past, to be fair to the nation's present, and to safeguard the nation's future, the budget must also pass a "moral test."

The Republican budget resolution fails both of these standards.

Because the American people deserve to know exactly what ills Republicans have in store for them, I strongly oppose S. Con. Res. 3 and urge all Members to join me in voting against the reckless, cruel, and heartless measure that will do nothing to improve the lives or well-being of middle and working class families.

Pamela Gross dreads repeal of Medicaid expansion. Still, millions of people like Gross, could face immediate effects. While her disability allows her access to Medicare coverage, she also relies on Medi-Cal, California's Medicaid program, to help pay for costs Medicare doesn't. Gross says she was insured before Obamacare became law. But her Medi-Cal coverage, which she relies on to pay her monthly premiums and co-pays, hung in the balance each year when she received a Supplemental Security Income cost of living increase. The minor jump in pay threatened to push her out of eligibility for the program, which would leave her without the means to pay for a private insurance policy and the doctor visits and medications she says her life literally depends on.

"I asked my doctor recently, with all that's going on would I make it without treatment?" The doctor's answer: "No," Gross says.

Because Obamacare expanded eligibility for Medicaid and increased the program's income limits, Gross no longer has to be concerned each year that the cost-of-living increase she receives from her SSI income will throw her out of coverage. That would change if Medicaid expansion is eliminated as part of the law's repeal.

"If they repeal I could completely lose eligibility," she says. "I would die."

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. FERGUSON), a new member of the Budget Committee.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the fiscal year 2017 budget resolution.

The need for this process can best be explained by a story I have been telling my colleagues.

A little over 6 years ago, I lived in a pretty decent house. One day I heard a knock on the door, and before I knew

it, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle had let a goat loose in my house. Now, for 6 years that goat has been messing in and destroying my house. I want to renovate my house, but before I can, I have to get the goat out of the house before it does any more damage. It makes no sense to start fixing up my house until I can get the goat out. Voting for the fiscal year '17 budget resolution gets this goat out of my house.

Mr. Chairman, make no mistake: we must renovate our house; we must undo the Affordable Care Act. We can no longer as a nation hold on to policies that rob us of our freedom of choice, that destroy family finances, that rob people of their jobs, and leave the most vulnerable with substandard care.

Now is the time for a 21st century healthcare system that puts patients and doctors first and sends government regulators and rulemakers to the back row. No more 32 percent increase in Georgia premiums; no more having your doctor pulled away from you; and no more government mandates.

This is not a return to the pre-ObamaCare status quo, but is a new approach to putting consumers in the driver's seat. The first step in this process is to gut ObamaCare with this resolution, and I am honored to support it.

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Chairman, I will remind the gentleman that his vote today to repeal the Affordable Care Act will result in 581,000 people from his State of Georgia losing their healthcare coverage, 71,000 workers losing their jobs, and an economic loss of \$39.4 billion in gross State product, over 5 years, for the State of Georgia.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. JEFFRIES), a distinguished member of the Budget Committee.

Mr. JEFFRIES. Mr. Chairman, this is a sad day in the history of this country as Republicans begin the process of destroying health care in America.

"Repeal and replace" is just a slogan. It is not a solution. For more than 6 years, we have been waiting for a credible Republican healthcare plan, and none has been forthcoming. All you have is smoke and mirrors, and the American people are getting ready to get screwed.

Under the so-called Republican plan, seniors will be forced to pay more for their medicine. Under the so-called Republican plan, children with pre-existing conditions, like pediatric cancer, will be at risk of being kicked off of their health plans or of being denied health coverage. Under the so-called Republican plan, young people in America will no longer be able to stay on their parents' health insurance through the age of 26. Under the so-called Republican plan, more than a million people who are receiving drug treatment because of opioid addiction will be at risk of being denied that life-saving care.

Under the so-called Republican plan, premiums will go up, co-pays will go up, deductibles will go up; and the American people will be screwed. People in Michigan, Pennsylvania, Wisconsin, Ohio—screwed. Seniors in Florida—screwed. People on the west coast and on the east coast—screwed. People in Appalachia and rural America—screwed.

The only folks who will benefit are the fat cats who are part of the healthcare cartel. The system, indeed, is rigged, and the American people should pay attention as to who is jamming them up.

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Chairman, in response to the gentleman from New York, when he says we do not have a plan, I reference him to all of the plans that are here on the desk. He says we don't have a plan, but then he references all of the things that will happen under the Republican plan. He can't have it both ways.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. WOMACK), who is a member of both the Budget Committee and the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. WOMACK. I thank the distinguished chair of the Budget Committee for giving me some time to talk today. She is a distinguished person, a colleague, a classmate, and somebody I have the utmost respect for.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the House budget resolution and to recognize the very important first step we are taking in our country today regarding ObamaCare. By adopting this budget resolution, we will set into motion the repeal of the Affordable Care Act.

Last week, on this very floor, the minority leader, Ms. PELOSI, stood here and called ObamaCare a magnificent success. Yet, since being sworn into office in 2011, I have heard just the opposite from my constituents. Every single day, I have heard that ObamaCare is raising the cost of health care, is creating uncertainty in Arkansas, is hurting Americans, and that we need to replace it with real reforms that focus on the patient, not the government.

This law is not just bad for patients and healthcare consumers. ObamaCare's onerous mandates and endless regulations are hitting industry across the board. It stifles business; it squelches private sector job growth; it hurts our economy. Let me give you an example.

Mr. Chairman, Superior Linen Service, in my district, employs over 100 people. Prior to the enactment of ObamaCare, Superior Linen Service recognized the importance of having a healthy workforce and was already providing quality health insurance to its employees, and it was able to manage its payroll insurance benefits in-house for the entire 60 years of its existence. After the passage of the Affordable Care Act, Superior Linen Service could no longer manage the sheer amount of

paperwork it took to prove that it was, in fact, complying with the law.

Let me be clear. Thanks to ObamaCare, the company provided no new benefits, but had to outsource its payroll and management at a cost of \$100,000 a year. This is just one of many examples. This is an important day. I urge a "yes" vote on the resolution.

□ 1145

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Chairman, I will remind my colleague that his vote today to repeal the Affordable Care Act will result 234,000 people from his State of Arkansas losing their healthcare coverage, 28,000 workers losing their jobs, and an economic loss of \$15.8 billion in gross State product over 5 years for the State of Arkansas.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY), a member of the Energy and Commerce Committee.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Chair, I want to say right now I believe—and it will be true, you will see—that Republicans will regret the repeal of ObamaCare.

Hospitals in rural and underserved areas are panicking right now because they are finally getting paid through ObamaCare to serve low-income people. Jobs will be lost. Those hospitals could close. Thirty million people will lose their benefits.

I want to tell you, on the Energy and Commerce Committee, I have been hearing for years ever since ObamaCare passed, all these horror stories that my Republican colleagues embrace as evidence that this thing isn't working. Never once have they been willing to sit down with us.

We don't claim that the bill is perfect, but we know that there are millions and millions of people with pre-existing conditions or who run out of insurance when they hit their lifetime caps. We know it has helped, and yet never has a Republican been willing to sit down with us and craft amendments that would make this legislation better.

Repeal means that the Republicans will make Americans sick again.

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Chairman, I would just like to note that it is ObamaCare that has, sadly, hurt these rural hospitals, healthcare providers, and people living in those rural areas. As a matter of fact, since January of 2010, there have been at least 80 rural hospitals that have had to close. The damage has already been done.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARRINGTON), a freshmen on the Budget Committee.

Mr. ARRINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of S. Con. Res. 3 that would begin the process to repeal ObamaCare.

Our experimentation in the Soviet-style, central planning of our healthcare system has been an abject failure: ObamaCare has failed our middle and working class families who

have seen an uncontrollable increase in deductibles and premiums; it has failed our providers who spent years pursuing their passion for healing our sick but now find themselves spending more time filling out paperwork than caring for their patients; it has failed our small businesses that create 64 percent of the jobs in this country.

Although the pathway of ObamaCare has been paved with good intentions, it has led to a series of disastrous, unintended consequences. To use a medical analogy, ObamaCare has made America sick; and when America is sick, rural America is in the ICU.

I represent 29 rural counties in west Texas, ag producers, oil and gas and renewable energy operators, community bankers, and community hospitals. Like many rural areas throughout the country, my district is feeding and clothing the American people, bolstering our economy, and strengthening our national security.

While large hospitals also suffer under ObamaCare, community hospitals are simply unable to handle the crushing weight of ACA's shrinking reimbursements, regulatory burden, and unfunded mandates. Since ObamaCare was implemented, 80 rural hospitals have closed and 600 more are in danger of closing. Without access to quality health care, our hardworking families in middle America are left high and dry.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Chairman, I yield an additional 15 seconds to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. ARRINGTON. Mr. Chairman, one of the greatest travesties of ObamaCare is not just the damage that it has done to our economy, but the destruction of a way of life of over 60 million Americans who call small town America their home. Whether it is producing reliable and affordable energy or a safe and abundant supply of food, people from all over the country rely on rural communities to make America great.

We must repeal ObamaCare, restore market forces, and return to patient-centered care.

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Chairman, I will remind my colleague that his vote today to repeal the Affordable Care Act will result in 1.8 million people from his State of Texas losing their healthcare coverage, 175,000 workers losing their jobs, and an economic loss of \$107 billion in gross State product over 5 years for the State of Texas.

I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. LARSEN), a distinguished member of the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee.

Mr. LARSEN of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in opposition to this budget resolution that would begin the process of repealing the Affordable Care Act without a plan to replace it, and I rise on behalf of my constituents who are imploring Congress to save the Affordable Care Act.

Luanne from Coupeville, Washington, wrote to me. She said:

As someone with several serious pre-existing conditions, I could not get insurance coverage in the past. My husband and I spent an incredible amount of money—including retirement savings and out-of-pocket dollars—for my care and prescriptions. There were truly times when we had to choose food over medication.

And without the ACA, Jennifer from Lynnwood told me that her best friend "will be forced to work as many jobs as she can in order to obtain money due to the costs of her pregnancy that will no longer be covered. . . . She needs the Affordable Care Act, as do many Americans. Please, I beg you, do not get rid of it. . . . The Republicans in Congress do not understand how much of us low-income Americans need this."

These are just two of the hundreds of Washingtonians who have contacted me over the past 2 weeks.

Mr. Chairman, do not take away these lifesaving benefits from Luanne, Jennifer's friend, and the rest of my constituents.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this bill.

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SMUCKER), who is a new member of our Budget Committee.

Mr. SMUCKER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this resolution, which will be the first step to repealing ObamaCare.

I, like so many of my colleagues, have heard from citizens all across my district in regard to the impact of this system on them. I want to share a conversation I had recently with a constituent.

Tim Hollinger called me. Tim and his wife, Phyllis, are residents of Mount Joy, Pennsylvania, in my home county of Lancaster. Tim is on Medicare, but Phyllis, who is self-employed, has a healthcare plan that she obtained through the ObamaCare marketplace.

Tim and Phyllis' annual income is \$53,000 per year. Phyllis' healthcare premium is over \$1,000 a month and carries a \$2,700 deductible. Let me repeat that. Phyllis' healthcare premium is over \$1,000 per month. That is 23 percent of their combined annual income.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Chair, I yield an additional 15 seconds to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SMUCKER. Mr. Chair, now Phyllis receives a Federal subsidy that covers 35 percent of that monthly cost. She takes pride in the fact that she has never taken a government handout in her life.

Now that she is on ObamaCare, the American taxpayers have to subsidize her health care. To Phyllis, that is not right. To Phyllis, this is about her pride. She is not asking for a lot. She is simply asking that she have access to affordable health care that doesn't require the American taxpayers to help her pay for it.

I look forward to working with my colleagues to fix our Nation's failed healthcare system.

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Chairman, I will remind my colleague that his vote today to repeal the Affordable Care Act will result 479,000 people from his State of Pennsylvania losing their healthcare coverage, 173,000 workers losing their jobs, and an economic loss of \$76.5 billion over 5 years in gross State product for the State of Pennsylvania.

I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE), a distinguished member of the Budget Committee.

Ms. LEE. Mr. Chairman, I thank our ranking member for yielding and also for his steadfast commitment to protecting the health and well-being of all Americans.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to this resolution, which would advance the repeal of the Affordable Care Act without any replacement in sight.

Let me be clear. This resolution would wipe away health care from 30 million Americans and raise premiums for millions more. It would also create chaos through our community and our economy and our Nation. It would put the insurance companies back in charge.

It is not just the Affordable Care Act that is on the chopping block. Republicans also want to cut women's reproductive health care. Once again, they want to defund Planned Parenthood, one of the Nation's leading providers of high-quality, affordable health care for women and families. Women would be denied breast cancer screenings and preventive health care. Community clinics in rural and urban communities would be devastated.

We know that Planned Parenthood is one of the Nation's leading providers of high-quality, affordable health care for women and their families. Denying access to healthcare providers such as Planned Parenthood will hurt women who need these services the most: low-income women and women of color. That is why I offered an amendment to protect these critical services. Shamefully, the Rules Committee refused to make it in order and even allow for a debate on this floor.

I also cosponsored the amendment with Representative POCAN and others within the Congressional Progressive Caucus opposing cuts to Medicare, Medicaid, and Social Security benefits. Republicans refused to allow a debate on this critical issue as well.

The most vulnerable—the poor, seniors, and disabled individuals—would be left to fend for themselves, and their lives would be shattered through these Republican cuts.

Mr. Chairman, we must stand up for the millions of people who have coverage because the Affordable Care Act really does save lives. It is a disgrace; Republicans continue to raise this war to kill the ACA without replacing it.

Once again, it will hurt the most vulnerable. People will be sicker again.

America will be sick again. This is a matter of life and death.

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GAETZ), who is a freshman on our Budget Committee.

Mr. GAETZ. Mr. Chairman, lend me your ears. I come to bury ObamaCare, not to praise it. The evil that men do lives after them.

This is the true legacy of the last 8 years: a doubling of the national debt and \$4 trillion in additional spending projected through ObamaCare.

What have my constituents gotten from ObamaCare? Higher taxes, higher premiums, unaffordable deductibles, crippling drug costs, fewer choices, and more mandates.

This resolution shows what will happen if we do nothing. Inaction will lead to \$30 trillion in debt, the greatest generational theft the world has ever known.

So it is past time to get the Federal Government out of the healthcare mandate business. Let people buy insurance across State lines; allow people to own their own healthcare decisions through health savings accounts; block-grant Medicaid to our States, our laboratories of democracy; and let's reinvigorate a Federal system that is promised by our Founders.

The jobs data cited by the Democrats doesn't assume the positive economic benefits that come from ObamaCare repeal, including, according to the Congressional Budget Office, \$200 billion in additional economic activity, more jobs, more opportunity, and more freedom. This is a flawed study that my friends across the aisle cite, and it is the Republican resolution before this body that offers a better way.

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Chairman, I will remind my colleague that his vote today to repeal the Affordable Care Act will result in 1.6 million people from his State of Florida losing their healthcare coverage, 181,000 workers losing their jobs, and an economic loss of \$90.4 billion in gross State product over 5 years in Florida.

I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), the distinguished Democratic Whip.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, every American will be affected by this vote, not just the 20 million people who will lose their insurance immediately. Thirty million, in total, will lose their insurance. Everybody's premium will ultimately go up. Preexisting conditions will not be available. Seniors will pay more for prescription drugs. 25-, 24-, 23-year-olds will be dropped from the insurance of their families.

The fact of the matter is—the gentleman from Florida that just spoke—there is not a better way that has been proposed. There is some discussion about across State lines. There is some other discussion about health savings accounts, which is great if you have the kind of salaries we have; but if you are an average American trying to support your family, getting additional

funds to put into a health savings account is not available to you.

Mr. Chairman, this budget resolution is an abdication of responsibility and duty. Rather than showing Republican spending and revenue priorities, it is nothing more than a vehicle for expediting a repeal of the Affordable Care Act and taking insurance coverage away from 30 million people.

□ 1200

Again, let me remind you it is hundreds of millions of people that will be adversely affected.

Since taking the House majority, Republicans have held 65 votes on this floor to undo healthcare reforms that have brought the uninsured rate to its lowest in recorded history and banned discrimination and discriminatory practices, such as denying coverage to Americans with preexisting conditions or charging women higher rates than men simply because of their gender.

Now our Republican colleagues want to repeal the Affordable Care Act without immediately replacing it, contrary to at least 12 of their colleagues in the United States Senate—Republicans—saying that is not the right way to go. That is what this resolution would do.

By the way, they should have adopted this resolution last Congress by April 15. They didn't do so.

This is not a real budget resolution. This is simply a device so that they can jam through repeal of the Affordable Care Act in the United States Senate contrary to the existing rules. It would come at a severe cost to our economy and our budget sustainability.

In addition to the 30 million who would lose their insurance, tens of millions more, as I have said, would see their costs go up. A report by the non-partisan Commonwealth Fund and Milken Institute found that the repeal would lead to the loss of 3 million jobs, and the Committee for a Responsible Federal Budget found it would add \$350 billion to deficits over the next 10 years.

Let us be clear, Mr. Chairman, a vote for this budget resolution is a vote to take health insurance away from 30 million Americans and adversely impact the health care of millions more.

I urge my Republican colleagues who have serious concerns about our fiscal path and misgivings about repealing the Affordable Care Act without replacing it: let's lay down a marker that Congress should not rush headlong into this costly repeal not only in terms of dollars, but in terms of health security consequences for the American people.

Mr. Chairman, I urge the House to vote "no" on this dangerous and destructive resolution.

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Chairman, I do want to note, once again, for my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, if they say we have no plans, I want to reference them several plans that have been filed, and I will leave those here on the desk so they can pick those up at their convenience.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE).

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, the Affordable Care Act is a collection of failed policies and many empty promises.

The American people have spoken. They do not want ObamaCare's high-cost, job-killing, conscious-violating healthcare system. Since the enactment of ObamaCare, almost 5 million Americans have lost their insurance plans and their own doctors. This is a far cry from the fake promises that were made on this House floor in the dark of the night when we were told: "Pass the bill so that we can figure out what is in it."

The American people are the ones paying for these failed promises. In fact, it is expected that in 2017, ObamaCare premiums will grow by an average of 22 percent across America. ObamaCare is hurting individual citizens, and it is also hurting small businesses. Out of 75 issues, small-business owners ranked the cost of health insurance as the number one problem they faced in 2016.

ObamaCare is neither affordable, and it is certainly not better care. We cannot afford ObamaCare. Health care should be a decision made by individuals in America, not by bureaucrats here in Washington, D.C. The repeal bill is the first step in finally correcting this huge legislative blunder. Replace ObamaCare with a free-market alternative that provides affordable health care to all Americans. Let Americans choose their health care.

ObamaCare has the efficiency of the post office and the compassion of the IRS, and it is time to make America healthy. Repeal this government control of our health.

And that is just the way it is.

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Chairman, I will remind my good friend that his vote today to repeal the Affordable Care Act will result in 1.8 million people from his State of Texas losing their healthcare coverage, 175,000 workers losing their jobs, and an economic loss of \$107 billion in gross State product, over 5 years, in Texas.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. CASTOR), who is a distinguished member of the Energy and Commerce Committee.

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I am compelled to come to the floor this morning to oppose the Republican attempt to pull the rug out from under American families.

Why are we going to a repeal bill without a replacement?

It is irresponsible. What you are doing is you are throwing American families into quicksand. Here is a dirty little secret: this is also a fiscally irresponsible move because this is likely to balloon the debt and the deficit.

Now, what I hear from my families back home in Florida is that the Affordable Care Act has been a godsend to them, and that includes the 9 million families that have private health

insurance. The Affordable Care Act has provided vital consumer protections to prevent them from being discriminated against for a preexisting condition or being canceled if they do get sick, and it has kept premium costs in check.

We also have a lot of Floridians who depend on Medicare; and because of the ACA, Medicare is stronger. In 2015 alone, the average Medicare recipient has put about \$1,000 back into their pocket because the ACA closes the doughnut hole.

I urge the House to vote “no.” Don’t throw American families into chaos and don’t wreak havoc on our economy.

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. MARSHALL).

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of today’s resolution to repeal the Affordable Care Act.

As a physician, I have lived the nightmare of the ACA for the past 6 years. Because of ObamaCare, I know more physicians leaving their practice this year than any other year. With \$12,000 deductibles and annual premium spikes of over 50 and many times over 100 percent, ObamaCare has made health care truly unaffordable and unattainable for many, many people. In fact, it would be irresponsible for Congress to sit back and watch the ACA continue its death spiral and bankrupt our country.

As we begin to replace ObamaCare, we want to reassure Americans we will not pull the rug out from anyone. If you are on a current exchange policy or have preexisting conditions, we will have a period of transition and high-risk pools that will provide you with quality, affordable alternatives.

Like many others, my district sent me here to fix health care, and we intend to do just that.

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Chairman, I will remind my colleague that his vote today to repeal the Affordable Care Act will result in 137,000 people from his State of Kansas losing their healthcare coverage, 19,000 workers losing their jobs, and an economic loss of \$10.5 billion in gross State product, over 5 years, for Kansas.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. CICILLINE), who is a distinguished member of the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Chairman, for 8 years, House Republicans have wrongly claimed that the Affordable Care Act will be catastrophic for hardworking Americans.

Here are the facts: since its passage, the ACA has helped cover 20 million previously uninsured Americans; 95 percent of America’s children are now covered; almost 130 million Americans with preexisting conditions now have the peace of mind to know that they will not be denied health services; and healthcare costs have been growing at the slowest rate in 50 years.

But as Republicans prepare to take control of the White House, it is clear

they don’t have an actual plan to replace ObamaCare. Not only will their repeal and displace plan cut off millions of Americans—men, women, and children—from quality, affordable health care, but it will also have devastating impacts on our economy.

Repealing the Affordable Care Act will cause the loss of 2.6 million jobs, a majority of which will be non-health industry jobs. It is projected that my home State of Rhode Island will lose more than 12,000 jobs.

This budget resolution will not only increase prescription drug prices for our seniors, raise premiums and out-of-pocket expenses for Americans who buy insurance, but will lead to significantly larger yearly deficits and contribute more than \$9.5 trillion in debt over the next decade.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this budget resolution, to protect the American people’s access to quality, affordable health care, and to vote “no.”

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. MITCHELL), who is one of our freshman Members.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Chairman, I rise to support the resolution to give relief to the millions of Americans who are struggling to access health care due to the destructive impact of the Affordable Care Act. Americans were promised that, with the passage of the Affordable Care Act, costs for health insurance would decrease and patients could keep their plans and their doctors if they liked them. Americans have now seen the truth: massive increases in premiums, constantly rising deductibles and copays, and fewer plans with fewer providers.

Just because an individual or a family has insurance does not mean they can access and afford health care. Health insurance means little if they cannot find a participating doctor or afford the deductible. In Michigan, premiums have risen over 17 percent this year, and deductibles are up an average of \$492.

There is a plan. I will hand carry it over for you to read it. I suggest we not instill fear but, rather, we move forward with a better way to provide health insurance. Broken promises have led us to a broken healthcare system. We promise to fix it and, beginning today, we are going to do just that.

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Chairman, I will remind my colleague that his vote today to repeal the Affordable Care Act will result in 618,000 people from his State of Michigan losing their healthcare coverage, 101,000 workers losing their jobs, and an economic loss of \$54 billion in gross State product, over 5 years, for Michigan.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN), who is a distinguished member and former chairman of the Ways and Means Committee.

(Mr. LEVIN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Chairman, I just want to say to my colleague from Michigan: Hundreds of thousands of people are going to lose their insurance under a plan that was agreed to by the Republican Governor, and I will send you the numbers in your district.

Mr. Chairman, the Republican effort to repeal the ACA, causing 30 million Americans to lose their health insurance, is built on a foundation of misrepresentations and falsehoods. Yesterday, the Speaker said the Affordable Care Act is collapsing. It is not. Nationwide, enrollment is higher than it is has ever been, and the percentage of Americans without health insurance is at the lowest level on record.

What is collapsing is the time for Republicans to move beyond their rhetoric and come up with a plan. They say they will produce a comprehensive replacement, but they have been saying that for 7 years.

Mr. NEAL is here. Seven years, Mr. NEAL, we have been hearing that.

Those files on the Republican desk—I wish you would raise them again—aren’t a plan. They are a ploy.

Republicans say repealing the Affordable Care Act will help people, and there is at least a sliver of truth to that claim. The GOP repeal bill will help millionaires, providing them an average tax cut of over \$50,000 a year. At the same time, it will actually raise taxes on millions of moderate and middle-income families who will lose tax credits for purchasing health insurance.

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GARRETT), who is one of our freshman Members.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to make a clarification because while I support this resolution, I oppose the description that some here have used. They are calling it a budget. This isn’t a budget. It is a paper trail of crimes our government commits against the future of our Nation vis-a-vis overwhelming debt. We need to be honest. We are sitting on \$20 trillion in debt, and aside from starting the repeal of the unaffordable care act, this does nothing to address that.

Reluctantly I will vote for it to repeal the monstrosity that is the unaffordable care act.

We were told we need to pass the bill so that we could find out what was in it. Well, we found out what was in it. We saw premiums skyrocket; we saw families lose their plans and their doctors, even the ones they liked and they wanted to keep; and we saw businesses struggle. Now we are left in a position where we need to pass this resolution to get rid of what we found.

Liberty and self-determination are the lifeblood of this Nation, and the Nation is terminally ill. Our debt is a cancer that continues to grow; and like a cancer, it doesn’t discriminate. It is colorblind, it is gender neutral, and it doesn’t care about your political affiliation or what State you are from. It is here, and it continues to grow.

Our children are being encumbered, packaged, and sold to the gallows by way of unprecedented debt. This is an unprecedented treatment, but if we continue down the ObamaCare unaffordable care act path that we are on, the results are guaranteed.

Today's resolution provides treatment for some of the symptoms, but it is about time that we started getting to the root causes of the disease. The more government encroaches on the lives of its citizens, the more debt grows, the less our liberties can breathe, and the sicker we become. I may be new here, but in Virginia we keep a balanced budget; and it is about time we got serious about one in D.C.

□ 1215

I will vote to pass this here today, but I refuse to call it a budget. I refuse to ignore the problems the unaffordable care act was meant to address. Problems aren't political, solutions are, and we can provide a better way.

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Chairman, I will remind my colleague that his vote today to repeal the Affordable Care Act will result in 327,000 people from his State of Virginia losing their healthcare coverage, 52,000 workers losing their jobs, and an economic loss of \$31 billion over 5 years in gross State product for Virginia.

Mr. Chairman, how much time remains?

The CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Tennessee has 14¾ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Kentucky has 14¾ minutes remaining.

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. WELCH), a distinguished member of the Energy and Commerce Committee.

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Chairman, on probably the most important issue, we are having the dumbest debate. We say the healthcare bill is good. You say it stinks.

We think it is good because we think it is good that kids, until they are age 26, can stay on their parents' plan. We think it is good because people with preexisting conditions ought to have access to health care, and we think it is good that a person who gets sick shouldn't lose their health care.

You say it is bad, even though the plan was based on a Heritage Foundation initiative and adopted largely in Massachusetts by a Republican governor.

Bottom line, you are the majority in the House; you are the majority in the Senate; and you have got the Presidency. You have got some responsibility to show us the beef. Where is the plan?

Now, there is a lot of paper over there, but you haven't shown us a plan. And here is why: because when you put pen to paper, all hell is going to break loose on your side because you have to move beyond the rhetoric to figuring out how you are going to pay to keep

our kids on our healthcare plan. You are going to figure out how to pay if we are going to let folks with preexisting conditions have health care.

Those don't solve themselves, and you don't have a plan. We are entitled, the American people are entitled, to have it.

The CHAIR. Members are reminded to address their remarks to the Chair.

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Chairman, it is now my honor to yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. RODNEY DAVIS), one of the leaders of our conference.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, ObamaCare is not working. We know this because the average increase for plans in Illinois was between 45 and 55 percent this year. As a matter of fact, a good friend of mine had an 87 percent increase.

We know this because millions of Americans who were told they could keep their health insurance were kicked off their plans. We know it is not working because 31 million people are underinsured, meaning they can't afford to use the insurance they have. Deductibles are simply too high.

It is not enough to judge this law simply by the number of people who are insured, since it mandates people buy insurance anyway. We must remember the people paying premiums that continue to double and then have a deductible so high that it will never be reached.

That is not success. That is a problem for hardworking taxpayers, many of whom don't qualify for subsidies but were forced off their previous plans because they didn't meet the standards set by ObamaCare and now can't afford the plan they are mandated to buy.

We know it is not working because people in a third of our counties in the U.S. only have one insurance provider to choose from. ObamaCare is collapsing on itself.

Some say: Why not work to fix it? I did. We did. We passed my Hire More Heroes Act. It helps small businesses, helps our heroes. But we have to begin today to fix the bill itself.

To know why this process is needed, let's remember how we got here. This bill was rushed through Congress. It then had 20,000 pages of regulations just for that one bill.

But taking this first step to repeal it should not be mistaken for supporting the status quo before the ACA was put in place. We have a plan. We are going to cover preexisting conditions. Because my wife is a cancer survivor, we have to do that.

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Chairman, I will remind my colleague that his vote today to repeal the Affordable Care Act will result in 850,000 people from his State of Illinois losing their healthcare coverage, 114,000 workers losing their jobs, and an economic loss of \$66 billion in gross State product over 5 years for Illinois.

I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. NEAL), the

distinguished ranking member of the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. NEAL. Mr. Chairman, I want to tell you that the last speaker said this was rushed through Congress. It took 2 years to write this legislation. Even by congressional standards, this was not rushed through Congress.

We have waited 7 years to hear the alternative, and the gentlewoman from Tennessee has all of these plans over there, and she says: we have got plans right here. How about one plan that we might have a chance to focus on?

They have had the luxury of saying: we are going to do a better job without telling us what the better job entails.

The Governor of Massachusetts recently wrote to our delegation and to the leadership in the House and said: During the ACA repeal-replace deliberations, it is important that coverage gains, patient protections and market stability be maintained.

Let me give you some numbers from Massachusetts. 97.2 percent of the residents of Massachusetts have health care. 100 percent of the children in Massachusetts now have health care.

This is an effort at rhetoric. We want to hear what the plan is. We want to understand what the alternative is. We want to know precisely what is going to be included and, just as importantly, what will be excluded from the benefits that this Affordable Care Act has given to the American people.

Twenty-two million Americans now have healthcare insurance who didn't have it. Nine percent of the American people are without adequate health care. We should be fixing that.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. YARMUTH. I yield the gentleman an additional 15 seconds.

Mr. NEAL. I have heard this, in the 29 years I have been in Congress, time and again. Till an honorable effort is put forward, you know what the Republicans should be saying to us right now? Let's get on, together, with making it all work, instead of saying repeal and replace. How empty is that rhetoric?

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Chairman, it is my distinct honor to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. RYAN), who was the chair of our Budget Committee, our Ways and Means Committee, and now he is the Speaker of the House.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. My colleagues, I rise to urge our colleagues in the House to support this resolution, and let me tell you why.

This provides Congress with the legislative tools that we need to repeal and replace ObamaCare. This is a critical first step toward delivering relief to Americans who are struggling under this law.

In the weeks ahead, several steps will be taken to provide relief. Some steps will be taken by this body. Some steps will be taken by the new administration, including, after he is confirmed as HHS Secretary, our own colleague from Georgia (Mr. PRICE).



Our goal is a truly patient-centered system, which means more options to choose from, lower costs, and greater control over your coverage. And as we work to get there, we will make sure that there is a stable transition period so that people don't have the rug pulled out from under them; so that this will be a thoughtful, step-by-step process, and we welcome ideas from both sides of the aisle.

But today, I can't help but think back to, when we were debating this law in 2010, what was said at the time. I was a member of the minority then. I stood right here and pleaded with the majority not to do this. Don't take something so personal like your health care and subject it to a Big Government experiment. Don't do something so arrogant and so contrary to our founding principles.

But they pushed it all the way through, making all kinds of promises. People were promised that their premiums would go down, but, instead, they are skyrocketing. Look at the new premium increases announced just this year: Kansas, 42 percent increase in their premiums; Illinois, 43 percent; Pennsylvania, 53 percent; Nebraska, 51 percent; Alabama, 58 percent; Minnesota, 59 percent; Tennessee, 63 percent increase in premiums; Oklahoma, 69 percent increase this year in premiums; Arizona, 116 percent increase in their premiums.

People were promised: if you like your plan, you can keep it. Well, guess what? That was rated the lie of the year that year. People lost their plans.

People were promised all sorts of choices. You will have all these great menus of choices to choose from. A third of all the counties in America today, you get one choice. Five whole States, one insurer. If you have one choice, that is not a choice, that is a monopoly.

My colleagues, this experiment has failed. This law is collapsing while we speak. We have to step in before things get worse. This is nothing short of a rescue mission.

By taking this step today, we are doing what is right. We are stepping in and stopping the collapse from doing more harm to the working families of America, to bring the kind of relief and bring the kind of solutions that we need to really achieve the noble goal here.

Everyone in America should have access to affordable health care, including people with preexisting conditions. This is what we want to achieve, but that is not what is happening under ObamaCare. The law is collapsing. The insurers are pulling out. People can't afford it. The deductibles are so high it doesn't even feel like you have got insurance in the first place.

This is a rescue mission. This is a necessary move, and I urge all of our colleagues to do what is right because the time is urgent. On top of this, to my colleagues, we need to keep our promise that we made to the American people, and this helps us do just that.

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Chairman, I will remind the Speaker that his vote today to repeal the Affordable Care Act will result in 211,000 people from his State of Wisconsin losing their healthcare coverage, 46,000 workers losing their jobs, and an economic loss of \$25.7 billion in gross State product over 5 years in Wisconsin.

It gives me great pleasure now to yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), the distinguished Democratic leader and architect of the Affordable Care Act.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding. I am so proud of him and his leadership as the ranking member on the Budget Committee.

I am so sorry that the Speaker left the floor because I have some very good news for him. Clearly, he does not understand what the Affordable Care Act has brought to our country in terms of expanding benefits, lowering costs, and expanding the access of many more people to the promise of our founders, of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, a healthier life, and the freedom to pursue their happiness.

I understand why the Speaker may want to concentrate on some mythology that he presented about the Affordable Care Act, because he is not going to focus on what this bill on the floor does today, and the Republican budget. It does not create more good-paying jobs, or raise wages. It does not invest in infrastructure to rebuild our Nation.

The Republican plan does not invest in the education of our children or the lifetime learning of working people. It does not help Americans find balance between work and family. It does not reduce the deficit. In fact, it increases the deficit. And it does not seek to drain the swamp of secret money from our elections.

Instead, the Republicans are feeding their ideological obsession with repealing the ACA and dismantling the health and economic security of hard-working families.

We all know that a budget should be a statement of our values. What is important to us as a nation should be reflected in our budget proposals. I always say: Show me your values, show me your budget.

Well, you heard me say some of what this budget does not do. As we get further into the next stage of the budget, we will see that what their budget does is just broaden, widen the disparity in income in our country, give tax breaks to the high end. And part of their tax breaks for the high end is to repeal the Affordable Care Act so they can eliminate the tax on those who are helping to fund the Affordable Care Act.

So let me just talk about the Affordable Care Act for a while, because one of the things that the public should know is that the ACA, Medicare, and Medicaid, are now wed. If you mess with the ACA, it directly impacts these other important initiatives, Medicare and Medicaid.

The Republicans have never supported Medicare. They opposed it at its origin and, over time, continued to oppose it.

□ 1230

In the nineties, their Speaker, Newt Gingrich, said Medicare should wither on the vine. Their Speaker, PAUL RYAN, has in his budget removing the guarantee of Medicare for our seniors. Remove the guarantee. That means you get a voucher and you go shop for Medicare in this nonexistent health plan that they put forth.

Republicans talk about how they are going to repeal and replace. It is interesting illustratively, but not realistic in terms of the fact that, for 6 years, they have had a chance to propose an alternative. We have seen nothing.

What we have seen is cut and run. They want to cut benefits and run. They want to cut savings and run. They want to cut access and run. They want to cut Medicare and run. They want to cut Medicaid and run. The list goes on and on. They want to cut jobs. We will lose 3 million jobs if they have their way with their nonexistent cut-and-run plan on the Affordable Care Act.

Let's talk about the relationship between ACA and Medicare and Medicaid. Hospitals will be devastated under the ACA repeal because they will be left with uncompensated care.

One of the challenges to hospitals was that they must care for people who come in and don't have the ability to pay. With the Affordable Care Act, we now take care of that. That alleviates the cost to corporate America or those who are providing health benefits to their workers, adding between \$1,000 and \$3,000 a year per policy because they are carrying the uncompensated care cost. The Affordable Care Act alleviates that.

The reality is, as Mr. NEAL, our new ranking member on the Ways and Means Committee, has said, Medicaid is now a health program that crosses the economic spectrum. It is not just for the poor. People think of Medicaid as a poor people initiative—no. It enables mothers to work their way out of poverty by providing affordable coverage for their children—yes.

It enables people with disabilities to get the care needed to live and work in the community, and it provides critical nursing home care for middle class elderly who have spent down their savings and have no other alternatives. As Mr. NEAL says, Grandma is going to be living in the guest room or in the attic or in the basement if you cannot have nursing home care.

This is very important to families because we want a budget that enables people to have good-paying jobs, increase their paycheck so that they can afford their home, address the aspirations of their children, and have a dignified retirement. If they have to care for their aging parents, they do less for

their children. This assault on Medicaid is an assault on the financial stability of families across the board, whatever their age.

Furthermore, Medicaid is one of best tools to fight addiction. We made a big deal about our opioid legislation. Americans who previously did not have access to health care and, therefore, self-medicated with opioids and other painkillers are able to access diagnosis, treatment, and pain management. Medicaid provides real care for the addiction and underlying condition to turn for the better for individuals and their families and the community. The list goes on and on.

The jobs issue. In most of your communities, healthcare providers, hospitals, et cetera, are the biggest employers. They won't be anymore. Millions of jobs will be lost.

Mr. PALLONE, our ranking member on Energy and Commerce, another committee of jurisdiction, keeps making that point. Why are you being, he says, ideological about this when the practical effect is about the economic security of our families? I thank Mr. PALLONE for that.

Mr. BOBBY SCOTT, the ranking member on the Education and the Workforce Committee shows what happens to States if you overturn the Affordable Care Act. In his own State of Virginia, he can give testimony to the increased cost to the State or lack of meeting the healthcare needs of constituents.

The ACA guards and strengthens the health care and economic security of every American, no matter where he or she gets health insurance. It delivers transformational progress in terms of coverage, quality, and cost.

Much has been said about the fact that more than 20 million people now have access to affordable health care. This is a wonderful and remarkable thing, but that is only part of the story.

Every American who has access to health care benefits from this. Most Americans receive their health benefits in the workplace. If you do, you now cannot be discriminated against because of a preexisting medical condition.

You cannot be discriminated against if you are a woman. No longer is being a woman a preexisting medical condition, which means you paid more if you are a woman.

No longer can the insurance companies levy lifetime limits for a preexisting condition that you may have or even for the care that you are getting on a new basis. The list goes on and on.

Do you know how many people have a preexisting medical condition? There are 100 million families affected by preexisting conditions, such as if your child is born prematurely.

I, myself, have five children. Long ago, insurance companies said to me: You are a poor risk because you have had five children. I said: I thought that

was a sign of my strength. I didn't know that you were measuring it as a weakness.

Any excuse would have done, but not with the Affordable Care Act. It stands there as a pillar of economic and health security. It stands there as a pillar of economic security like Social Security, Medicare, and Medicaid, which, again, the Republicans and Newt Gingrich opposed in the 1990s and said would wither on the vine. In his budget, PAUL RYAN takes away the guarantee. But it is a pillar of economic and health security.

So the proposal today increases the deficit, does not create jobs, undermines the health security of the American people, and does not do much in any regard to address the challenges I posed in the beginning. It is no wonder they want to talk about the Affordable Care Act. They have nothing to recommend in their budget resolution.

The GOP's repeal plan will raise premiums. Mr. Chairman, the rate of growth of healthcare costs in our country has been greatly diminished by the Affordable Care Act. In the more than 50 years that they have been measuring the rate of growth, it has never been slower than now.

Repeal will create chaos that will echo in the health coverage and costs of every American. Chaos is the order of the day for them.

The American people will not be dragged back to the days when an illness or injury meant financial ruin, that you might not get a job because someone in your family was ill and was going to raise the cost of health care in a company that might hire you, that you could lose your home. Most bankruptcies spring because of not being able to pay medical bills.

In short, we will not allow the Republicans to make America sick again. I urge a "no" vote on this unfortunate resolution.

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. FASO), one of our newest Members.

Mr. FASO. Mr. Chairman, I thank the new chairman of the Budget Committee for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I have listened to the debate and I understand the difficulty that both sides have with fixing this system.

We clearly believe the system needs to be repealed and replaced. Moreover, the system needs to be reformed. And there is perhaps no better prominent Democrat in this country who has made the case for reforming this system. I quote former President Bill Clinton, who said just last October:

So you have got this crazy system where, all of a sudden, 25 million more people have health care and then the people who are out there busting it, sometimes 60 hours a week, wind up with their premiums doubled and their coverage cut in half. It's the craziest thing in the world.

President Bill Clinton.

Mr. Chairman, this is just the first step in terms of fixing this problem.

The taxes, the premium increases, the loss of coverage, the small businesses who have been priced out of the market, the discouragement of employment in our country because of the costs that are imposed on the business sector through the ACA have to be fixed; they have to be addressed. Today is just the first step in addressing that.

Later, we will have regulatory changes that come from the Department of Health and Human Services. More importantly, we will all have to come back here to work out a new plan to fix it.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to vote for this resolution.

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Chairman, I will remind my colleague that his vote today to repeal the Affordable Care Act will result in 939,000 people from his State of New York losing their healthcare coverage, 131,000 workers losing their jobs, and an economic loss of \$89.7 billion in gross State product over 5 years in New York.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MAXINE WATERS), the distinguished ranking member of the Financial Services Committee.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Chairman, I rise to oppose this budget, which is designed to repeal—not replace—ObamaCare.

I am adamant about this because of what I have witnessed all of my life. I am going to share with you—and some of you may have never heard of these things—that I have watched people die from preventable diseases.

I have watched, over the years, from the time I was a child, where people had home remedies. They didn't have any prescription drugs.

I watched as my great-grandmother was in pain, in tears, because of arthritis and rheumatism. We had to rub her down with something called liniment.

I have watched men get up and try to go to work with pneumonia. They tried to heal pneumonia with what was known as hot toddies.

I have watched as children have died. Little children used to walk around with little bags around their neck with something in it called aspidity that was supposed to protect them from harm. They had pneumonia. They had colds. That is all they had. They didn't have a doctor. They died from preventable diseases.

Now we have 20 million more people who are insured under this healthcare plan. This is a healthcare plan for all Americans.

The Republicans will tell you that, yes, they are going to give you something better, but they have been saying this for 8 years. They have been after what is known as ObamaCare for 8 years. Why don't they have a remedy? Why don't they have a plan? Why don't they have anything?

They didn't have anything when they started to attack ObamaCare, they don't have anything today, and they are not going to have anything better than the ACA.

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I want to read the names of some of the groups that have written to us in support of S. Con. Res. 3. There are more than 35 names on here, but I am going to read off some that we would recognize very quickly:

The American Center for Law and Justice, Association of Mature American Citizens, Citizens Against Government Waste, Concerned Women for America, Health Benefits Group, Independent Women's Voice, Medical Device Manufacturers Association, National Association of Manufacturers, National Association of Wholesaler-Distributors, National Restaurant Association, National Retail Federation, National Taxpayers Union, Society for Human Resource Management, and the U.S. Chamber of Commerce.

I just want to extract one paragraph out of the U.S. Chamber's letter that they have written:

The U.S. Chamber of Commerce supports S. Con. Res. 3, the concurrent resolution setting forth the congressional budget for 2016, an initial step toward making critical improvements to the American healthcare system."

I think that you can see that not only do our constituents support a change, but also these companies around the country.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Chairman I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT), the distinguished ranking member of the Education and the Workforce Committee.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this budget resolution and its intent to compromise the health insurance of all Americans.

Republicans continue to pursue the repeal of the Affordable Care Act, root and branch, despite the fact that there is no credible plan to deal with the chaos that this repeal will create.

Thirty million Americans will lose their insurance, the vast majority being working families. There is no plan to protect the other Americans who have enjoyed improved consumer protections and benefits.

Although the rates have gone up, they have gone up at half the rate that they had been going up before ObamaCare, and most of those in the marketplace don't even have to pay those increased prices because of increased tax credits.

□ 1245

When Republicans talk about repeal and replace, the only thing guaranteed is the repeal part. Republicans have shown little interest in producing an alternative. We have heard lots of complaints, but we have not seen a plan that will make things any better.

Remember, when Medicare was created, most of the Republicans in Congress voted "no." Republicans in the House have voted numerous times, over

60 times, to repeal some or all of the Affordable Care Act without proposing a credible alternative, and now we have some vague ideas but no plan to deal with the total chaos that will be created if ObamaCare is repealed.

I urge my colleagues to save the health and economic security of all Americans by defeating this resolution.

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Chairman, what I would like to do now is to read some of the broken promises that have occurred through the Affordable Care Act.

Here is one that I think we will all recognize: "That means that no matter how we reform health care, we will keep this promise to the American people: If you like your doctor, you will be able to keep your doctor, period." Those are remarks by the President at the annual conference of the American Medical Association back on June 15, 2009.

Here is another one: "I will sign a universal health care bill into law by the end of my first term as president that will cover every American and cut the cost of a typical family's premium by up to \$2,500 a year." This was in a speech on June 23, 2007.

Here is another: "You should know that once we have fully implemented, you're going to be able to buy insurance through a pool so that you can get the same good rates as a group that if you're an employee at a big company you can get right now—which means your premiums will go down." Which we know has absolutely not happened. These were remarks that were made by the President at a campaign event on July 16, 2012.

Here is another one, remarks made by the President after a meeting with the Senate Democrats on December 15, 2009: "Whatever ideas exist in terms of bending the cost curve and starting to reduce costs for families, businesses, and government, those elements are in this bill." As we know today, those elements have not come to fruition.

Another: "So this law means more choice, more competition, lower costs for millions of Americans." These were remarks by the President on the Affordable Care Act and the government shutdown on October 1, 2013.

Another: "In my mind the Affordable Care Act has been a huge success, but it's got real problems." This came from Jonathan Chait, "Five Days That Shaped a Presidency," on October 2, 2016.

The last one that I will read to you: "I'm willing to look at other ideas to bring down costs. . . ." These were remarks by the President in the State of the Union Address on January 25, 2011.

In 2013, PolitiFact rated this the number one lie of the year. At publication, PolitiFact found that there were at least 37 instances when President Obama made this vow to the American people. I can say that, as we look at these statements that were made, these are not statements that have come true.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE), the distinguished ranking member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chair, I have listened to every Republican who spoke during this budget debate, and I am convinced they will repeal the ACA and run. There will never be a replacement because they don't have the votes for it. The Republicans are ideologues. They don't believe we should regulate insurance companies or help people pay for their premiums, so they can never support a replacement plan that would do these things.

The ACA is a market-based plan to deal with the healthcare crisis that we faced 8 years ago. More and more people didn't have health insurance. Insurance companies wouldn't sell them health insurance if they had a pre-existing condition like cancer. People were paying more and more out of pocket, and the fact of the matter is that we stepped in in a practical way, not because we were ideologues, because we were looking at the situation practically to help people.

What did we do? We provided 20 or 30 million people who didn't have insurance with insurance. For those who had health insurance through their employer, we guaranteed them a good benefit package, and we limited their out-of-pocket costs. We looked at this practically because we are trying to help the American people. We were not ideologues. We didn't care about whether you were on the left or the right.

But what the Republicans are doing today is really a farce. They don't care about the average American. They don't care about all these people who have insurance now who didn't have it before, about the benefits that they are getting, that their out-of-pocket costs have been limited. No. They are just ideologues. They want to repeal this. They have no intention of ever replacing it, in my opinion, and they want to go back to the good old days when the insurance companies controlled the market. That is what we are going to have. Repeal and run, that is what you are doing.

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. PRICE), a distinguished member of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to this sham Republican budget resolution.

After wringing their hands for the last 8 years about debt and deficits, today's resolution makes clear Republicans care about fiscal discipline only when it is a Democratic President they are dealing with. This budget resolution would add \$9.5 trillion to the debt

over the next 10 years. It has only one purpose: to provide for the eventual repeal of the Affordable Care Act, but it would ruin our fiscal health as well.

Of course, the ACA was fully paid for by Democrats with new revenue and with cost-containment measures. Non-partisan budget experts say that repealing the ACA would actually increase the deficit by \$350 billion. So the hypocrisy of our Republican colleagues on this issue is simply breathtaking, even by Washington standards.

Of course, repeal of ACA wouldn't just blow a hole in the budget, it would: destabilize the insurance market and cause premiums to skyrocket; eliminate insurance coverage for 30 million Americans, including 4 million children; raise taxes on the middle-class; burden local and rural hospitals with more uncompensated care; eliminate Medicaid benefits for millions of vulnerable citizens; and abolish vital patient protections, including the provision that stopped insurance companies from discriminating against those with preexisting condition.

After more than 6 years, moreover, we are still waiting for that comprehensive Republican plan to replace the ACA. News flash: they don't have one.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman an additional 15 seconds.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. They simply don't have one. Rather than work with Democrats to improve the ACA, Republicans continue to put their own political ideology over the health and well-being of the Americans we are all pledged to serve.

I urge all Members to forcefully reject this budget resolution.

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Washington (Ms. JAYAPAL), a distinguished member of the Committee on the Budget.

Ms. JAYAPAL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to this budget resolution. It begins the gutting of the Affordable Care Act, stripping health care for millions of working families across the Nation, including over three-quarters of a million in my home State of Washington.

Here is the bottom line: This repeal will put into chaos small businesses, hospitals, and community health centers. I have one of those in Seattle called the International Community Health Services, which provides culturally appropriate health services to anyone in need. Recently, an elderly woman at ICHS shared her fears about the ACA repeal. She and her husband, a heart attack survivor who went through bypass surgery, rely on Medicare and Medicaid for affordable health services. They have an annual joint income, Mr. Chairman, of \$14,000, and they would be unable to afford quality care if the ACA repeal happens and, let's be clear, with absolutely no better plan to replace it.

Mr. Chairman, the budget resolution is a moral document. It does translate our values into commitments, and it should tell the world what the United States stands for. Looking at this budget resolution, I cannot help but conclude that our moral compass will be broken if we pass this resolution. I urge my colleagues to oppose this immoral budget resolution.

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. VELÁZQUEZ), the ranking member of the Committee on Small Business.

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. I rise in strong opposition to this resolution. Mr. Chairman, if Republicans go forward with this plan to dismantle the Affordable Care Act, 30 million Americans will lose health insurance. In New York State alone, 1.6 million of our neighbors—who gained coverage through ACA—will lose their health insurance and will see their health insurance taken away, and 2.7 million New Yorkers who have enrolled in Medicaid could lose coverage.

But this is not just about Medicaid, and it is not just about who obtained coverage through the exchanges. This is about the young person just out of college who can stay on their parents' insurance until they turn 26, giving them time to secure employment and coverage on their own. It is about patients with preexisting conditions who, until the ACA, were blocked from securing quality medical insurance. It is about women who have faced gender discrimination in the insurance market. These are the people Republicans will harm with their irresponsible attack on our healthcare system.

Now, let me also note this: the Republican slogan, repeal and replace, is a sham. What are they going to replace the ACA with? They have never, not once, put together a realistic, defensible plan to replace the ACA. Their plan should be called repeal and displace because it will displace millions of Americans from their health coverage. Reject repeal and displace. Vote "no" on this bill.

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Chairman, I have no other speakers, and I reserve the balance of my time to conclude the debate of the budget resolution after the Joint Economic Committee has finished its debate.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TIBERI) and the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY) each will control 15 minutes on the subject of economic goals and policies.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. TIBERI. Mr. Chairman, it is a pleasure for me to be here in my role as chairman of the Joint Economic Committee. I am also pleased to have a couple of our new Members here today.

I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LAHOOD), a new member of the Joint Economic Committee.

Mr. LAHOOD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of this budget resolution as a first step in the process to repeal and replace ObamaCare. It is undeniable that ObamaCare has failed. It has broken promise after promise to the American people.

Constituents in my district in central Illinois are watching their premiums skyrocket by an average of 15 percent. This chart next to me here shows, all across the country in State after State, premiums have skyrocketed. Citizens also face deductibles that are so high that they try to get by without going to a doctor.

One constituent from Roseville, Illinois, whose insurance costs have gone up 75 percent, stated to me recently: "This is crazy. Almost half of my paycheck goes to insurance. How do they expect us to afford this?"

These burdensome costs stifle families and our small businesses' ability to participate in and help grow our economy. We have a mandate from the American people to fix this broken system and to rescue citizens from escalating healthcare costs.

□ 1300

The goal is not to pull the rug out from underneath anyone. In fact, we are working to provide a stable transition to better, more affordable health care. We must have something that is economically sustainable and fiscally responsible, something that actually works.

I look forward to working with my colleagues to replace ObamaCare with a system grounded in economic reality—a market-driven, consumer-centered healthcare system that provides Americans with more choices, lower costs, and greater flexibility. That is why we are working on a replacement system that will expand consumer choice through health care focused on their needs; a system that will spur innovation in health care; attract new doctors and healthcare providers; and protect patients with preexisting conditions.

Mr. Chairman, we must help Americans gain access to insurance they can afford. Passing this legislation is one step towards helping people and fulfilling our promise to the American people.

I urge my colleagues to support this resolution. We owe it to our citizens.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Here we are more than 3 months into fiscal year 2017, debating a budget which is not really a budget resolution. Even the majority admits it is nothing more than a shell to help them repeal the Affordable Care Act. It doesn't contain any way to grow jobs and it doesn't contain any new ideas to grow our economy.

With all of the majority's rhetoric about deficits over the last decade or more, this budget explodes the deficit and adds \$2 trillion—as in T—to the national debt, only to set the stage for repeal of healthcare assistance to millions of Americans.

What is more, the Congressional Budget Office has told us that repeal of the Affordable Care Act would increase the deficit by \$353 billion over 10 years. Now, many of my colleagues have noted the devastating effect of the repeal of the Affordable Care Act, the effect that it would have on millions of Americans' health. Thirty million Americans would lose insurance, including 4 million children. The cost of prescription drugs would go up for our seniors. Young people would lose the coverage on their parents' health care. Women wouldn't be protected, and men with preexisting conditions. Pregnancy would no longer be covered.

The Affordable Care Act has made critical progress for Americans. Millions have gained health care that they never had before. Our uninsured rate is now at 8.9 percent. It is the lowest rate in the history of our great country. It is nearly halved from before the Affordable Care Act took place, as you can see from this chart. This is something we should be proud of. We have allowed more and more and more Americans to have health care when they need it. It is literally a life-and-death situation to millions of Americans.

This reckless repeal of the Affordable Care Act will also cause economic havoc. It not only hurts people; it hurts our economy. Now, just last month, our economy added 144,000 private sector jobs—the 75th straight month of job growth in the United States of America. That is something we can all be proud of. That is the longest stretch of job creation since 1939 in our Nation's history.

That is in stark contrast to the way things were at the time that the last Presidential transition took place. When Barack Obama took the oath of office, our economy was shedding a staggering amount of jobs. In December of 2008, the economy lost 695,000 jobs. The next month, another 598,000 jobs gone. We were losing, over a period of time, roughly 700,000 jobs a month. The banks were teetering, lending had halted, the auto industry was exploding, our Nation was in economic turmoil. The combination of a bursting asset bubble and bank panic brought this country to the edge of collapse. It was the worst financial crisis in global history, according to the head of the Federal Reserve, Ben Bernanke—in global history.

Today we have a very different story. Thank you, President Obama. Our unemployment rate, which had soared up to 10 percent, is now at 4.7 percent. That is a great achievement. In 2016 alone, our country added 2.2 million jobs, bringing the total to over 15 million new jobs created over the last 7

years. Instead of shedding jobs and losing jobs under the prior administration, we were gaining.

Just look at this chart. We moved from the deep red valley of political devastation, economic loss of jobs and suffering, to moving out of our economic troubles to a continued growth of blue job creation. In the job creation and in our economy, we also expanded health care to help our people. Just look at this chart. It tells the story—the deep red valley of economic devastation caused by the last Republican administration and the steady job growth under President Obama.

We are now seeing stronger job growth after years of stagnation. Over the past year, average hourly earnings rose to 2.9 percent; another great success. But now we are considering a heartless and, I would say, reckless plan to repeal the Affordable Care Act; a move that threatens to undo our progress and will turn millions of lives absolutely upside down across this great Nation.

A report issued this month by The Commonwealth Fund outlined the disastrous economic consequences of the majority's plan. In just the first year of repeal, our economy will lose nearly 2.6 million jobs and over \$255 billion in economic output. Over the course of 5 years, our economy will lose over \$1.5 trillion in output.

These devastating job losses are not limited to the healthcare industry. As was pointed out by many Democratic speakers, our whole industry is intertwined. You can't cut the Affordable Care Act without also impacting not only people, but also the delivery of services through our hospitals, and also Medicaid and Medicare. It is all intertwined. It is reckless to move forward and say: Oh, we are going to come up with a good plan.

Well, where is it?

You have had years to come up with it. We have never seen it.

We will lose not just two-thirds, over 1.6 million, of jobs just in health care, but also in related industries—construction, retail, and other sectors. What is more, this repeal plan would also place massive financial burdens on our State budgets.

The Commonwealth Fund report estimates that in just the first year, States would lose out on \$8.2 billion in tax revenue. Over 5 years, our States would lose over \$48 billion in tax revenue. That means hits to our schools, our roads, our first responders, and our neighborhoods.

Of course, repealing the Affordable Care Act will hurt the millions of people who have directly benefited from it. People have come up to me and told me on the street: I finally have health care; I have health care for my children; I know if they get hurt, they are going to be taken care of.

People in my home State of New York will be hit very hard. Over 2.7 million New Yorkers have healthcare coverage today that they did not have

before because of the Affordable Care Act. Now their health care is on the line, for they are among the 30 million who would lose health coverage under the majority's repeal plan.

This not only hurts people, it cost economic development—a loss of \$89.7 billion in gross State product for my State of New York alone.

This is the way it is all across the country. Americans of every political stripe, who work hard and play by the rules and think they finally have health care, who have at long last gained it, are now worried about what is going to happen to them tomorrow. They deserve better. They deserve what they already have. They, at least, deserve a plan.

We should not repeal. We shouldn't repeal it in the first place. But if you are going to repeal it, let's be responsible about it and have what it is you are going to put back in place to help people. It is reckless to repeal it.

In the most advanced, most economically prosperous country in the history of the world, our people deserve the certainty that they can have access to health care for themselves and their families. With all that is at stake—health care for millions, the loss of 2.6 million jobs, economic havoc—it is simply irresponsible to move forward with a budget, and reckless to repeal the Affordable Care Act without any real solution to help people.

I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to vote against this budget resolution, which is nothing more than a plan to take health care away from Americans.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. TIBERI. Mr. Chairman, it is a pleasure to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. FRANCIS ROONEY), a new Member of this Congress, and a new member of the Joint Economic Committee.

Mr. FRANCIS ROONEY of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I rise to speak about and oppose the travesty known as ObamaCare.

The need to replace this program was obvious on day one. It is a failed socioeconomic experiment perpetrated by people who don't believe in individual choice and don't understand free market competition. In fact, we can see less than half of the folks that were supposed to sign up have done it because it is a bad deal for them. Nothing promised under this medical health insurance program has proved true. Care costs have gone up, premiums and deductibles have skyrocketed.

We have another chart here, if I might, that shows a projected 25-plus percent increase in premiums in 2017. My State of Florida is 19 percent. Coverage has been circumscribed and reduced. This business about keeping your doctor has proven to be another falsehood. You can't afford to keep your doctor. You can't afford to keep your insurance.

The entire program was flawed from the beginning. It is a top-down, government-run boondoggle. All it has done is

create monopolies for a bunch of insurance companies. I have heard heart-wrenching personal stories from so many families in southwest Florida who have suffered severe financial burdens and have had reduced and dropped coverage because of ObamaCare.

Paying more for less is bad policy. It is bad economics. It is a raw deal for Americans. Now we have the opportunity to do three things to turn the page and put this disaster of ObamaCare behind us. We have the opportunity today to enact the resolution, which will lead to repealing ObamaCare. We have the opportunity to have Dr. PRICE take the helm of Health and Human Services and begin a substantial administrative overhaul. And we have the opportunity to put in the replacement plan that has been talked about, described in A Better Way for America, which provides a seamless transition into a new form of health care, leaves no one without coverage, and assures the continual coverage of preexisting conditions. But it will offer consumer choice the American way. It will make coverage affordable and competitive.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. TIBERI. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. FRANCIS ROONEY of Florida. It will stimulate competition for insurance coverage across State lines for moving an archaic and artificial barrier, which shouldn't be there in the first place. Lastly, it will encourage innovation in the delivery of health care in advances in treatment.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, first, I would like to apologize to two dedicated members of the committee on which we serve: Mr. BEYER and Mr. DELANEY, who have been sitting here, waiting for a long time. But Mr. NADLER tells me he has an absolute pressing emergency and must go first.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER).

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chairman, repeal of the Affordable Care Act will be a disaster for the American public. It will send America back to the days when people went bankrupt trying to pay medical bills, and seniors on Medicare spent \$3,000 on prescription drugs alone.

Adding insult to a very serious injury, the bill before us would defund Planned Parenthood because of debunked accusations. Republicans are asking us to pass legislation that will punish an invaluable organization without any evidence of due process because they don't agree with it. This bill smacks of an unconstitutional bill of attainder.

If we do pass this bill, we will leave millions of women with no access to health care. Republicans know that community health centers and Medicaid networks do not include enough

providers, particularly OB/GYNs, to take on all of Planned Parenthood's patients.

□ 1315

By voting to defund Planned Parenthood today, we will be leaving 2.7 million women and men with no access to reproductive health care.

What a statement for the Republicans to make as their first major piece of legislation. They are saying to the American people, and to women in particular: Republicans don't care about your health or about your families. Republicans just care about politics.

Well, my Democratic colleagues and I care about the health of the American people, about American jobs and about American women. That is why we will vote against this absurd budget resolution; that, and the ACA repeal.

I urge my colleagues to vote against this bill.

Mr. Chair, this budget resolution is primarily a vehicle to repeal the Affordable Care Act and to defund Planned Parenthood, steps the Republicans are taking without putting any plans in place to ensure that millions of men, women, and children will continue to have access to health care they need. They are proposing to let Americans get sick, even die, to score cheap political points.

Repeal of the Affordable Care Act will be a disaster for the American public. In New York State alone, it will result in 2.7 million people losing health insurance and will create a \$3 billion hole in the state budget. It will also result in the loss of thousands of health care jobs across the state. Republicans will send America back to the days when people went bankrupt trying to pay medical bills. It will mean that people with private insurance—from their employers or the individual market—will have their insurance cancelled for pre-existing conditions. It will mean that people once again will be subject to annual or lifetime limits—in other words, if you get an expensive illness, a heart attack or cancer, your insurance will run out just when you need it the most. And people on Medicare will have to pay an average of \$3,000 a year for prescription drugs.

Adding insult to very serious injury, this bill would defund Planned Parenthood because of debunked accusations. If members have real evidence that Planned Parenthood broke the law, they should send it to federal law enforcement agencies. Instead, they are asking us to pass legislation that will punish an invaluable organization without any evidence or due process because they don't agree with them. My colleagues who love to cloak themselves in the Constitution should know Congress is not the law enforcement body this bill asks us to be—it smacks of a clearly unconstitutional bill of attainder.

If we do pass this bill, we will leave millions of women with no access to health care. Republicans may claim that women can go elsewhere for the services provided by Planned Parenthood—they've even gone so far as to provide additional funding for Community Health Centers to fill the gaps they clearly know this bill will leave behind. But did they check to see if the existing Community Health Centers or Medicaid networks can fill these gaps? Did they ask HHS to confirm that Com-

munity Health Centers even employ enough OB/GYNs and other specialists to actually take on the patients currently treated by Planned Parenthood? Of course not.

Republicans know HHS would never be able to make that determination. More than half of Planned Parenthood patients rely on Medicaid. Most states do not have enough Medicaid providers, particularly specialists like OB/GYNs, to absorb Planned Parenthood's patients. By voting to defund Planned Parenthood today, you are leaving 2.7 million women, men, and families with no access to health care.

Republicans are leaving women to suffer with no access to prenatal care, condemning seniors to undiagnosed cancers, and leaving children to suffer with asthma and other chronic illnesses all to make a political statement.

And what a statement for Republicans to make as their first major piece of legislation. They are saying to the American people, and women in particular: Republicans don't care about your health. Republicans don't care about your families. Republicans just care about politics.

Well, my Democratic colleagues and I care about the health of the American people. We care about American jobs. We care about American women. That's why we will vote against this absurd budget resolution. I urge my Republican colleagues to join us.

Mr. TIBERI. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from the great State of Virginia (Mr. BEYER.)

Mr. BEYER. Mr. Chair, I rise with my Joint Economic Committee Democratic colleagues to address the terrible effects that the Republican budget will have on this country's health.

I listened with rapt astonishment to Speaker RYAN's recitation of the percentage increases in the premium costs for insurance, for insurers on the Obama exchanges. But the Speaker omitted important facts.

Number one, more than 80 percent of ObamaCare customers get subsidies to help them pay the cost of these premiums. They do not pay the full cost and will not feel the brunt of these increases.

Number two, these increases are uneven. Yes, Arizona is up, but Rhode Island will decrease 14 percent. The Speaker cherry-picked the highest ones, omitting the overall increase.

But most importantly, number three, most people are unaffected because most people get their insurance through their employer, Medicare, Medicaid, or the VA. Only a small fraction of Americans actually buy insurance on the individual market. Premiums, for the average single person through the employer market last year, were exactly the same as those for families; only up 3 percent.

As an employer myself who offers health insurance to more than 300 people, and someone who is very concerned about the debt, my great concern is that the Republicans seem willing to throw out our total commitment to managing our debt for this repeal.



I have listened to my friends in the Freedom Caucus lament about our national debt and together we have made significant progress on the budget deficits.

But blowing up ObamaCare will blow up our national debt, the most fiscally irresponsible act since we waged two wars without paying for them.

A study by the Commonwealth Fund projects that repealing ObamaCare will cause the State of Virginia to lose up to 100,000 jobs and \$50 billion in business output.

I urge my colleagues to vote “no” on this most fiscally irresponsible plan.

Mr. TIBERI. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. DELANEY), another distinguished member of the Joint Economic Committee.

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Chair, we all know that hard-edged partisan politics has not only eroded the confidence that the American people have in our government, but it has caused government to function to a very low standard.

In my 4 years that I have been in this Congress, I have never seen a better example of that than what we have here today. Because today, we are considering a budget that is not only fiscally irresponsible, it doubles our deficits across 10 years, increases the national debt by \$10 trillion, but its sole purpose is to repeal the Affordable Care Act.

The purpose of today’s budget is not to amend the Affordable Care Act to preserve its strengths and tackle its weaknesses, nor is the purpose of today’s budget to repeal the Affordable Care Act and put something in place that has been well thought through and shared with the American public. The purpose of today’s bill is to repeal the Affordable Care Act in a cold, hard way and let the chips fall where they fall. And this is not being done because it is good policy.

Anyone who is serious about healthcare policy—even people who oppose the Affordable Care Act—who has looked at this issue, has concluded, by any measure, the Affordable Care Act should not be repealed without a replacement. It is being done for political reasons because my colleagues, unfortunately, for years, have told their supporters that they would repeal this bill at all cost, without having the courage or convictions to explain to them the consequences of repeal without replacement; nor without the determination to do the work to come up with an alternative.

The Affordable Care Act was passed 8 years ago. It was passed on a straight party-line basis, which was unfortunate. It had three important goals, which it has achieved: to expand health care in over 20 million people; to lower the overall cost of health care in this country, which is the most important number in our fiscal health; and to improve the quality of health care.

Is it perfect? No. Are we addressing its problems today? No. Are we repeal-

ing it without any replacement? Yes. By any measure, will that be bad for the public health and potentially cause a public health crisis in the United States of America? The answer to that is yes.

I urge my colleagues to reject the budget proposal.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Chair, I urge a strong “no” vote. This budget resolution jeopardizes the very health of our citizens and puts our economic recovery at risk. I urge a “no” vote.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. TIBERI. Mr. Chair, I am prepared to close, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chair, there are several perspectives, important perspectives, to health care and health insurance: one, value delivered to patients in terms of insurance plan options, choice of doctors, access to treatment, and, most importantly, health outcomes; two, health insurance premiums and healthcare cost sharing; three, budgetary cost to the Federal and State governments; four, supply of healthcare services, including by doctors and hospitals and through medications; and fifth, indirect costs to the economy, such as reduced job creation and labor force participation.

The Affordable Care Act fails on all five counts, and that is why we are here today, to start the process of repealing and replacing it. The program is dysfunctional, and its costs have become and will become more unsustainable.

Supposedly, the central objective for passing the ACA was to insure those who did not have coverage. I was there.

Yet, the increased government sprawl shown in this chart in health care is striking.

The Joint Economic Committee chart from the time of the law’s passage illustrates the law’s mind-numbing complexity. Unsurprising to anyone skeptical of bureaucratic solutions, the Obama healthcare system has not worked.

Instead of empowering innovators, doctors, patients, ObamaCare has implemented a complex scheme that relies on unelected bureaucrats. And this chart demonstrates that clearly.

Mr. Chair, ObamaCare means fewer choices. In fact, Kimberly, a constituent in my district, recently told me that she had a brain tumor. She said:

Virtually no doctors take the marketplace insurance, so I am left to change doctors who I have seen for 30 years and switch to new doctors who I don’t trust and cannot provide the same healthcare benefits that I have received in the past.

Traumatic for her.

Remarkably, the enrollment failure is happening, despite penalties on individuals failing to obtain coverage and on employers failing to provide it.

Even with billions of dollars in subsidies, in my opinion, this illustrates that many would likely prefer to trade

their subsidies for more flexibility, the choice of their own doctors, and useful alternatives.

ObamaCare also means higher premiums. Ohioans, on the individual marketplace, have seen increased premiums by 111 percent since passage of ObamaCare, and now in my State, the average premium is over \$5,000.

Republicans agree that the system needs reform, but ObamaCare cannot be reformed. The argument that parts of the American healthcare insurance system were not working previously, and that more people now have health insurance, is irrelevant to the decision to repeal ObamaCare. Nobody claims that the former system was perfect. I certainly don’t.

Certainly, the government can increase coverage with subsidies, increase coverage with mandates, but what has it done to the underlying health care that is being provided?

The extent and method by which ObamaCare increases coverage has caused huge and unnecessary collateral damage to all others in the marketplace, all others with respect to patient choice of their doctors, the quality of the care that they are receiving, the supply of health care, and, certainly, State and Federal budgets.

The focus of ObamaCare advocates has been almost exclusively on increasing the number of insured by government subsidy and mandate. I get that. I understand that, but not on maximizing healthy outcomes. Those aren’t the same things.

Health insurance is not an end in itself. Effective treatment to healthcare problems is.

Private investment is so needed to push forward medical discoveries, innovation, accelerate drug development, personalize medicine, and harness technology to coordinate our health care and help administrate it.

There is a better way. You will hear from the other side of the aisle that Republicans have no plan to replace ObamaCare. Here are the plans. It is just not true. The goal of the Republican plan is not to go back to the way things were before ObamaCare; it is to move forward.

We want to facilitate a well-functioning market in health care, and health insurance as well. In the United States, we let the marketplace work things out. Republicans want to fix those obstacles and make it better.

Among the features of the Better Way is: portability, patient-centered care, insurance across State lines, medical liability reform, new mechanisms for small businesses and individuals to power together to negotiate, flexibility for our Governors, a patient-centered, patient-focused program.

The government has a role and a responsibility to provide support for those who can’t afford it, for those who fall through the cracks. A refundable tax credit is part of our plan, addressing preexisting conditions is part of our plan, and keeping dependents up to 26 on their parents’ plan is part of our plan.

But the deeper points to recognize are: One, there is no reason why a free market could not offer insurance to individuals that provides continuous coverage throughout their lives. There is no reason that helping the poor should not limit the choices and flexibilities of everyone else, which ObamaCare has done, much less interfere with the large economy.

Moreover, the law has had an impact on employment. I see it every week. Economics Professor Casey Mulligan of the University of Chicago estimated that the ACA taxes will affect nearly half of the working population in America, reducing average wages, hours worked, and GDP.

And based upon CBO estimates, the overall impact of the ACA on the supply of labor will become progressively worse as time passes.

ObamaCare took certain problems in healthcare insurance—a large number of uninsured, lack of individual coverage for preexisting conditions, higher premiums for individuals—and used them as an excuse to create socialized medicine.

The repeal of ObamaCare will take us off that path and replacement will offer shortcomings to other problems.

Going forward, Republicans stand ready to provide support away from ObamaCare through a transition. And getting an improved healthcare system in place improves consumer choice.

I understand the anxiety that many are feeling right now listening to the Democrats tell them that health care is going to be yanked out from under them.

When I was a kid, my dad, a steel worker, lost his job. We lost our health care. We lost our insurance. I know what that anxiety is like. And I want to assure everyone today, that is not what we are doing here today.

I know what we are doing here today. We are empowering patients. We are empowering doctors, not bureaucrats. We are giving them more choices, more opportunities, and a better healthcare system.

Mr. Chair, I ask that we support this resolution.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. All time for the Joint Economic Committee has expired.

The gentlewoman from Tennessee has 6 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Kentucky has 2 minutes remaining.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Tennessee.

Mrs. BLACK. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. YARMUTH. I am prepared to close, and I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Chairman, everybody in this room wants the same thing. We want the best quality of care available to the most people at the lowest price. That is what every American wants. That is what Republicans and Democrats alike want.

We have put our plan to do that on the table. We recognize that there are

ways it could be improved. But the idea that there is a plan competing on the other side is just hilarious.

□ 1330

Last night, I testified at the Rules Committee before Chairman SESSIONS. Chairman SESSIONS introduced a bill last year. He had one cosponsor. That gentleman is no longer in the House, so he has no cosponsors as of now. His plan is called the World's Greatest Healthcare Act. I like the name, but I don't know how that relates to any of those other plans. I know that probably some of the elements are similar.

This is the problem with the exercise we are going through. We are heading down a road with no final determination or destination. We are going to repeal the Affordable Care Act, eliminating all the protections that we have provided for 300 million Americans—expanded coverage, expanded guarantees, benefits, and quality—and we don't know what the alternative is.

Waiving around a bunch of papers does not mean there is a plan. It does not mean that the Republicans can say to the American public: "Here is what your health care is going to look like when we get finished with our repeal and replace." They just can't do that.

That is why only 18 percent of the American people, according to a Kaiser survey, want this course of action, want a repeal without a replacement.

All I have to say is, if we go down this path, we won't have repeal and replace. What we will have is repeal and repent because we are going to owe a huge apology to the American people for the damage that we have caused.

I urge my colleagues to reject this resolution.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Chairman, after all the debate that we have had today, these facts remain: ObamaCare is failing; health coverage is becoming less affordable; health care is becoming less accessible; and the American people want and deserve something better than this broken status quo.

While my colleagues on the other side of the aisle are doing their best to defend this law and make excuses for the harm it is causing, Republicans promised the American people we will not ignore those in our country who are suffering under the current healthcare system.

Today, we have an opportunity to begin to bring relief to the American people. Today's vote will kick-start the reconciliation process through which we can and must repeal ObamaCare and pave the way to a patient-centered healthcare system, and I include in the RECORD letters supporting passage of S. Con. Res. 3.

CHAMBER OF COMMERCE OF THE  
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,  
Washington, DC, January 13, 2017.

TO THE MEMBERS OF THE U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES: The U.S. Chamber of Commerce supports S. Con. Res. 3, the concurrent resolution setting forth the congressional budget for fiscal year 2017, as an ini-

tial step toward making critical improvements to the American health care system.

Congress must repeal the "Cadillac" tax, the health insurance tax, the medical device tax, the employer responsibility penalties, and other harmful taxes of the Affordable Care Act that have increased health care costs for millions of Americans. As committees begin consideration of reconciliation legislation, the Chamber will continue to advocate strongly for those and other issues.

Furthermore, this proposal provides for modifications to enacted FY 2017 discretionary spending levels to bring them into alignment with the Appropriations Committee's existing allocation as part of the deeming resolution required by the Bipartisan Budget Act of 2015. These levels are consistent with the statutory limits established by the Budget Control Act and amended by the Bipartisan Budget Act. This legislation would also make changes to mandatory spending to reflect \$2 billion in mandatory savings—the same amount established in the reconciliation instructions.

The FY 2017 Appropriations bills include many Chamber policy priorities. The Chamber strongly supports completing work on those bills and hopes that passage of this budget resolution will provide the framework for their quick consideration, including beginning the important work on fiscal year 2018 bills.

Sincerely,

JACK HOWARD.

NATIONAL RETAIL FEDERATION,  
January 11, 2017.

Hon. PAUL RYAN,  
Speaker, House of Representatives, Washington,  
DC.

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,  
Democratic Leader, House of Representatives,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR SPEAKER RYAN AND DEMOCRATIC LEADER PELOSI: I write to share the support of the National Retail Federation (NRF) for S. Con. Res. 3, the fiscal year 2017 budget resolution. Please note that NRF may consider votes on S. Con. Res. 3 and related procedural motions as Opportunity Index Votes for our annual voting scorecard.

The Affordable Care Act (ACA) remains a great concern for NRF and the greater retail community. The ACA adversely influences staffing patterns, discourages full-time employment and adds to the cost of goods in retail stores. NRF opposed enactment of the ACA in 2010 but has also worked steadfastly to change the law since its enactment. We have supported reasonable bipartisan efforts to reduce the ACA's cost burdens and ease compliance concerns. The ACA remains a heavy burden for the retail community despite all of our efforts to fix and adjust to the law.

This budget resolution is the first step toward the eventual repeal of the ACA. We support this first step but will be closely watching the ensuing reconciliation legislation to help keep employment-based coverage as stable and predictable as possible. We strongly urge that the process of replacing the ACA be both bipartisan as well as deliberate. Consensus reform will build on the employment based system, which covers 178 million Americans, but not threaten this coverage in the effort to help others.

For all of these reasons, NRF supports S. Con. Res. 3 and ask for your vote in support.

Sincerely,

DAVID FRENCH,  
Senior Vice President, Government Relations.

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF  
WHOLESALE-DISTRIBUTORS,  
Washington, DC, January 12, 2017.

Hon. PAUL RYAN,  
*Speaker, House of Representatives,*  
Washington, DC.

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,  
*Democratic Leader, House of Representatives,*  
Washington, DC.

DEAR SPEAKER RYAN AND LEADER PELOSI: I write on behalf of the National Association of Wholesaler-Distributors (NAW) to express support for S. Con. Res. 3, the Fiscal Year 2017 Budget Resolution. Passage of the budget resolution will provide an important first step toward the repeal and replacement of the Affordable Care Act (ACA).

It has become painfully apparent that the ACA has not and will not achieve the affordability, competition and choice goals promised by its sponsors. Looking forward, NAW members are deeply concerned about the ACA's potential to do harm to the employment-based health insurance system through which some 170 million Americans acquire their health coverage, particularly as two ill-advised ACA financing components—the excise tax on high-cost health plans (the “Cadillac Tax”) and the annual fee on health insurance providers (the “Health Insurance Tax” or “HIT”)—take hold.

NAW looks forward to working with Members of both houses of Congress on both sides of the aisle in what we hope will be a collaborative effort to find common legislative ground on marketplace-driven, patient-centered ways to achieve shared access, cost-containment, and quality goals.

I advise that votes taken on and in relation to S. Con. Res. 3 may be considered key votes for the 115th Congress.

Sincerely,

JAMES A. ANDERSON, JR.,  
*Vice President-Government Relations.*

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF  
MANUFACTURERS,  
Washington, DC, January 12, 2017.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVES: The National Association of Manufacturers (NAM), the largest manufacturing association in the United States, representing manufacturers in every industrial sector and in all 50 states, urges you to support S. Con. Res. 3 the Obamacare Repeal Resolution.

The Budget Resolution takes the first step towards repealing the mandates and taxes resulting from the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act that are driving up the costs of healthcare for manufacturers. Manufacturers believe that repeal of the 40 percent excise tax on high cost plans, the Health Insurance Tax, the Medical Device Tax, and other fees and taxes associated with the Affordable Care Act will help employers contain rising health care costs.

Manufacturers historically have led the business community in providing health benefits to their employees and are committed to continuing this tradition in the future. At the same time, providing health coverage in an environment where costs are consistently rising represents a major challenge for the industry.

The NAM's Key Vote Advisory Committee has indicated that votes on S. Con. Res. 3, including podural motions, may be considered for designation as Key Manufacturing Votes in the 115th Congress.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

ARIC NEWHOUSE,  
*Senior Vice President, Policy and*  
*Government Relations.*

COUNCIL FOR CITIZENS AGAINST  
GOVERNMENT WASTE,  
Washington, DC, January 12, 2017.

U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: You will soon have the opportunity to vote on S. Con. Res. 3, a budget resolution that will begin the long-awaited process of repealing the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (ACA), better known as Obamacare. On behalf of the more than one million members and supporters of the Council for Citizens Against Government Waste (CCAGW), I urge you to support this important legislation.

Obamacare, which has been a disaster for patients and taxpayers since it was passed in 2010, cannot be fixed. Premiums have dramatically increased, co-ops and state exchanges have failed, and medical costs continue to skyrocket. Conservative estimates suggest that, by its sixth birthday in early 2016, Obamacare had wasted \$55 billion, while its onerous regulations and taxes have stifled economic growth and job creation.

Over the past year, more co-ops have collapsed; health insurers have abandoned numerous exchanges; and premiums have increased an average of 25 percent for 2017. Even worse, Obamacare has allowed overzealous Washington bureaucrats to meddle in Americans' most personal and private decisions concerning their health. At the same time, patients are getting less care for their plans due to fewer healthcare options and increasing medical costs; some counties have only one or even no healthcare insurance options (and have to pay a fine, as a result).

Obamacare must be repealed before it further damages consumers and the slow-growing economy. Passage of the “Obamacare repeal resolution” is the first step to accomplishing that critical objective. All votes on S. Con. Res. 3 will be among those considered for CCAGW's 2017 Congressional Ratings.

Sincerely,

TOM SCHATZ,  
*President.*

#### AMERICANS FOR TAX REFORM

Congress is expected to soon vote on S. Con. Res. 3, a budget resolution providing for repeal of Obamacare. The “repeal resolution” is step one in undoing the legacy of broken promises under the Barack Obama presidency which have led to higher healthcare costs, cancelled plans, lost doctors, and more than \$1 trillion in tax increases which hit millions of middle class families.

All members of the House and Senate should vote “yes” on the repeal resolution. The record of Obamacare is one of broken promises and failed policies. Poll after poll has shown the law is unpopular with the American people. Republicans campaigned on repealing Obamacare and this resolution will allow them to fulfill that promise.

Members of the Senate should also vote “no” on the numerous amendments expected to be offered during consideration of the repeal resolution. The purpose of this budget resolution is to allow for an expedited process to repeal Obamacare through budget reconciliation. These amendments will slow down the process and are largely an attempt for members to play political games.

Passing the repeal resolution will allow members of Congress to pass the first of many tax cuts over the next four years by repealing the more than \$1 trillion in higher taxes over a decade. Obamacare's tax hikes directly hit middle class families, in viola-

tion of President Obama's “firm pledge” not to raise any tax on any family earning less than \$250,000 per year. Passing the repeal resolution will allow members of Congress the opportunity to pass the first of many tax cuts over the next four years by repealing these taxes.

The Obamacare law imposed taxes on Health Savings Accounts and Flexible Spending Accounts and imposed an income tax increase on Americans with high medical bills. Obamacare levied a new tax on health insurance, a tax on medical devices, a tax on employer provided care, a steep “indoor tanning tax” and even a tax for not buying “qualifying” government-mandated insurance.

Passing the repeal resolution will also allow Congress to undo a long list of wasteful subsidies including the risk corridor and reinsurance programs as well as the Prevention and Public Health slush fund. Each of these programs and agencies have seen billions in taxpayer dollars wasted on partisan activities at a time when the federal government already spends far too much. Support for S. Con. Res. 3 is the first step toward enacting a conservative, patient-centered, fiscally responsible healthcare system and eliminating the broken promises, wasteful spending, and higher taxes of the Obama years.

#### AMERICANS FOR PROSPERITY

For years, our lawmakers in Congress have vowed to get rid of Obamacare. Now, they have their best chance yet to make good on their word.

Barack Obama's signature health-care law has failed to deliver on its promises, and continues to leave Americans with cancelled insurance plans, reduced access to doctors, and premium increases in the double digits—or worse.

Using a process called budget reconciliation, Obamacare's opponents in our new Senate can repeal large portions of the law with a simple majority, while leaving no possibility of a filibuster by lawmakers who want to keep it. Then, the resolution would just need to be passed in the House of Representatives and signed by President Trump after he takes office.

We can't let our lawmakers pass up this opportunity to turn back years of terrible policy and free Americans from Obamacare's burdensome mandates and costs.

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of this resolution so that we can pursue those solutions that will expand access to care, increase the quality and affordability of that care, and give the American people, not Washington, the power to choose what best fits their individual needs.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Chair, I rise today to express my grave concerns with the Republican budget proposal for 2017. The budget before us today is a disaster for the American people. Not only does it add \$9 trillion to the national debt and put our nation on the path to fiscal ruin, it begins the process of dismantling the Affordable Care

Act, taking health insurance away from 30 million Americans.

Our national budget is not just pages of numbers. It is a statement of our nation's values. By that measure, this budget is morally bankrupt.

The Affordable Care Act became law in March 2010, yet despite their condemnations of the law, Republicans have failed to present any comprehensive alternative in the nearly seven years since it was signed into law. Not one single proposal. The Majority Leader KEVIN MCCARTHY said it best at the Washington Post's Daily 202 interview on November 29th last year when he suggested our healthcare system should look more like the cable industry because of all the choices consumers have in that market. He said, "I always use the analogy, would I want to pick a cable company to watch what I want to watch on TV? I love the options that I have, I love the ability to switch, I love the different packages that I can pick if I like a certain sports team, or I want to watch HBO or something else. Why can't we have health care in a manner that we can do something to that extent?"

If Republicans think the American people want the cable industry to serve as a model for the health insurance market, our Republican colleagues are even more out of touch than I ever imagined.

After spending years and 65 votes to repeal the ACA, and warning Americans about the dire threats of budget deficits and the national debt, Republicans have suddenly done an about face. They no longer care about the fiscal impact of this budget which adds \$9 trillion to the national debt over 10 years. Nor do they care about the fiscal impact of repealing the Affordable Care Act which is estimated to cost \$350 billion over 10 years according to the Congressional Budget Office.

The House majority has also set its sights on dismantling our nation's premier social insurance program by including in the House Rules package the unprecedented requirement that each standing committee identify programs that can be moved from mandatory to discretionary spending. This is a chilling and thinly veiled move to begin dismantling the guarantee of Social Security, Medicare, and Medicaid, and tie the future of these essential programs to the uncertainty of the annual appropriations process.

I urge my colleagues to think long and hard about the far-reaching consequences of this budget on the well-being of the American people and the fiscal health of our nation and vote 'No' on final passage.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Chair, this bill is a critical first step in our effort to repeal the Affordable Care Act and deliver relief to the millions of Americans who continue to be hurt by this failing law.

The Affordable Care Act has helped some, but it's also inflicted tremendous harm to families and small businesses nationwide. And the damage grows bigger each passing year.

Out of pocket cost are skyrocketing—often more than \$10,000 a year.

Choices have disappeared.

And control over your personal health care decisions—whether it's which doctors you can see or which health plan you can have—is gone. It doesn't belong to the American people anymore. Instead, Washington is now in control of people's personal healthcare decisions.

It doesn't have to be this way.

The American people sent a clear signal in November. They are sick of this law because it hasn't improved their care, lowered their costs, or kept its promises.

They want the Affordable Care Act repealed and replaced with a 21st century system—one based on what patients and families want and need, not what Washington thinks is best.

Today, with this legislation, we have an opportunity to send a clear signal of our own: Relief is on the way.

That's what I want to say to all of my constituents in Texas.

People like Bill in The Woodlands, who just had his health plan canceled for the second year in a row.

People like Lauren in South Montgomery County whose premiums just went up to \$900 a month.

Families like the Thomas's in Montgomery, who say they have paid over \$24,000 this year for the poorest-quality care they have received in their adult lives. The Thomas's say it'll be \$30,000 before their insurance contributes a dime.

To the people of my district—to Bill, to Lauren, to the Thomas family—and to the millions of Americans across the country who are suffering because of the Affordable Care Act: Relief is on the way.

We are working to deliver health care solutions that truly lower costs, increase choices, and put Americans back in control of their own health care decisions.

That all starts today. It starts by passing this budget legislation and taking the crucial first step to repeal the Affordable Care Act.

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Chair, I rise today to express my grave concerns with the Republican budget proposal for 2017.

The budget before us today is a disaster for the American people. Not only does it add \$9 trillion to the national debt and put our nation on the path to fiscal ruin, it begins the process of dismantling the Affordable Care Act, taking health insurance away from 30 million Americans.

Our national budget is not just pages of numbers. It is a statement of our nation's values. By that measure, this budget is morally bankrupt.

The Affordable Care Act became law in March 2010, yet despite their condemnations of the law, Republicans have failed to present any comprehensive alternative in the nearly seven years since it was signed into law. Not one single proposal. The Majority Leader KEVIN MCCARTHY said it best at the Washington Post's Daily 202 interview on November 29th last year when he suggested our healthcare system should look more like the cable industry because of all the choices consumers have in that market. He said:

"I always use the analogy, would I want to pick a cable company to watch what I want to watch on TV? I love the options that I have, I love the ability to switch, I love the different

packages that I can pick if I like a certain sports team, or I want to watch HBO or something else. Why can't we have health care in a manner that we can do something to that extent?"

If Republicans think the American people want the cable industry to serve as a model for the health insurance market, our Republican colleagues are even more out of touch than I ever imagined.

After spending years and 65 votes to repeal the ACA, and warning Americans about the dire threats of budget deficits and the national debt, Republicans have suddenly done an about face. They no longer care about the fiscal impact of this budget which adds \$9 trillion to the national debt over 10 years. Nor do they care about the fiscal impact of repealing the Affordable Care Act which is estimated to cost \$350 billion over 10 years according to the Congressional Budget Office.

The House majority has also set its sights on dismantling our nation's premier social insurance program by including in the House Rules package the unprecedented requirement that each standing committee identify programs that can be moved from mandatory to discretionary spending. This is a chilling and thinly veiled move to begin dismantling the guarantee of Social Security, Medicare, and Medicaid, and tie the future of these essential programs to the uncertainty of the annual appropriations process.

I urge my colleagues to think long and hard about the far-reaching consequences of this budget on the well-being of the American people and the fiscal health of our nation and vote 'No' on final passage.

The CHAIR. All time for general debate has expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the concurrent resolution shall be considered for amendment under the 5-minute rule and is considered read.

The text of the concurrent resolution is as follows:

#### S. CON. RES. 3

*Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring),*

#### SECTION 1. CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2017.

(a) DECLARATION.—Congress declares that this resolution is the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2017 and that this resolution sets forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2018 through 2026.

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents for this concurrent resolution is as follows:

Sec. 1. Concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2017.

#### TITLE I—RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS

##### Subtitle A—Budgetary Levels in Both Houses

Sec. 1101. Recommended levels and amounts.  
Sec. 1102. Major functional categories.

##### Subtitle B—Levels and Amounts in the Senate

Sec. 1201. Social Security in the Senate.  
Sec. 1202. Postal Service discretionary administrative expenses in the Senate.

#### TITLE II—RECONCILIATION

Sec. 2001. Reconciliation in the Senate.  
Sec. 2002. Reconciliation in the House of Representatives.

#### TITLE III—RESERVE FUNDS

Sec. 3001. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for health care legislation.

Sec. 3002. Reserve fund for health care legislation.

#### TITLE IV—OTHER MATTERS

Sec. 4001. Enforcement filing.

Sec. 4002. Budgetary treatment of administrative expenses.

Sec. 4003. Application and effect of changes in allocations and aggregates.

Sec. 4004. Exercise of rulemaking powers.

#### TITLE I—RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS

##### Subtitle A—Budgetary Levels in Both Houses

##### SEC. 1101. RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS.

The following budgetary levels are appropriate for each of fiscal years 2017 through 2026:

(1) **FEDERAL REVENUES.**—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution:

(A) The recommended levels of Federal revenues are as follows:

Fiscal year 2017: \$2,682,088,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2018: \$2,787,834,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2019: \$2,884,637,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2020: \$3,012,645,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2021: \$3,131,369,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2022: \$3,262,718,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2023: \$3,402,888,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2024: \$3,556,097,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2025: \$3,727,756,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2026: \$3,903,628,000,000.

(B) The amounts by which the aggregate levels of Federal revenues should be changed are as follows:

Fiscal year 2017: \$0.  
Fiscal year 2018: \$0.  
Fiscal year 2019: \$0.  
Fiscal year 2020: \$0.  
Fiscal year 2021: \$0.  
Fiscal year 2022: \$0.  
Fiscal year 2023: \$0.  
Fiscal year 2024: \$0.  
Fiscal year 2025: \$0.  
Fiscal year 2026: \$0.

(2) **NEW BUDGET AUTHORITY.**—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the appropriate levels of total new budget authority are as follows:

Fiscal year 2017: \$3,308,000,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2018: \$3,350,010,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2019: \$3,590,479,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2020: \$3,779,449,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2021: \$3,947,834,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2022: \$4,187,893,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2023: \$4,336,952,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2024: \$4,473,818,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2025: \$4,726,484,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2026: \$4,961,154,000,000.

(3) **BUDGET OUTLAYS.**—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the appropriate levels of total budget outlays are as follows:

Fiscal year 2017: \$3,264,662,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2018: \$3,329,394,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2019: \$3,558,237,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2020: \$3,741,304,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2021: \$3,916,533,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2022: \$4,159,803,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2023: \$4,295,742,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2024: \$4,419,330,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2025: \$4,673,813,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2026: \$4,912,205,000,000.

(4) **DEFICITS.**—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the amounts of the deficits are as follows:

Fiscal year 2017: \$582,574,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2018: \$541,560,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2019: \$673,600,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2020: \$728,659,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2021: \$785,164,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2022: \$897,085,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2023: \$892,854,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2024: \$863,233,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2025: \$946,057,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2026: \$1,008,577,000,000.

(5) **PUBLIC DEBT.**—Pursuant to section 301(a)(5) of the Congressional Budget Act of

1974 (2 U.S.C. 632(a)(5)), the appropriate levels of the public debt are as follows:

Fiscal year 2017: \$20,034,788,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2018: \$20,784,183,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2019: \$21,625,729,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2020: \$22,504,763,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2021: \$23,440,271,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2022: \$24,509,421,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2023: \$25,605,527,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2024: \$26,701,273,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2025: \$27,869,175,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2026: \$29,126,158,000,000.

(6) **DEBT HELD BY THE PUBLIC.**—The appropriate levels of debt held by the public are as follows:

Fiscal year 2017: \$14,593,316,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2018: \$15,198,740,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2019: \$15,955,144,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2020: \$16,791,740,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2021: \$17,713,599,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2022: \$18,787,230,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2023: \$19,901,290,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2024: \$21,033,163,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2025: \$22,301,661,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2026: \$23,691,844,000,000.

##### SEC. 1102. MAJOR FUNCTIONAL CATEGORIES.

Congress determines and declares that the appropriate levels of new budget authority and outlays for fiscal years 2017 through 2026 for each major functional category are:

(1) **National Defense (050):**

Fiscal year 2017:  
(A) New budget authority, \$623,910,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$603,716,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2018:  
(A) New budget authority, \$618,347,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$601,646,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2019:  
(A) New budget authority, \$632,742,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$617,943,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2020:  
(A) New budget authority, \$648,198,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$632,435,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2021:  
(A) New budget authority, \$663,703,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$646,853,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2022:  
(A) New budget authority, \$679,968,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$666,926,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2023:  
(A) New budget authority, \$696,578,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$678,139,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2024:  
(A) New budget authority, \$713,664,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$689,531,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2025:  
(A) New budget authority, \$731,228,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$711,423,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2026:  
(A) New budget authority, \$750,069,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$729,616,000,000.

(2) **International Affairs (150):**

Fiscal year 2017:  
(A) New budget authority, \$61,996,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$51,907,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2018:  
(A) New budget authority, \$60,099,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$53,541,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2019:  
(A) New budget authority, \$61,097,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$55,800,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2020:  
(A) New budget authority, \$60,686,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$57,690,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2021:  
(A) New budget authority, \$61,085,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$58,756,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2022:  
(A) New budget authority, \$62,576,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$60,205,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2023:  
(A) New budget authority, \$64,141,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$61,513,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2024:  
(A) New budget authority, \$65,588,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$62,705,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2025:

(A) New budget authority, \$679,968,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$666,926,000,000.

(A) New budget authority, \$696,578,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$678,139,000,000.

(A) New budget authority, \$713,664,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$689,531,000,000.

(A) New budget authority, \$731,228,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$711,423,000,000.

(A) New budget authority, \$750,069,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$729,616,000,000.

(A) New budget authority, \$61,996,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$51,907,000,000.

(A) New budget authority, \$60,099,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$53,541,000,000.

(A) New budget authority, \$61,097,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$55,800,000,000.

(A) New budget authority, \$60,686,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$57,690,000,000.

(A) New budget authority, \$61,085,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$58,756,000,000.

(A) New budget authority, \$62,576,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$60,205,000,000.

(A) New budget authority, \$64,141,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$61,513,000,000.

(A) New budget authority, \$65,588,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$62,705,000,000.

Fiscal year 2025:

(A) New budget authority, \$67,094,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$63,915,000,000.

Fiscal year 2026:

(A) New budget authority, \$68,692,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$65,305,000,000.

(3) **General Science, Space, and Technology (250):**

Fiscal year 2017:  
(A) New budget authority, \$31,562,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$30,988,000,000.

Fiscal year 2018:  
(A) New budget authority, \$32,787,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$32,225,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019:  
(A) New budget authority, \$33,476,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$32,978,000,000.

Fiscal year 2020:  
(A) New budget authority, \$34,202,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$33,645,000,000.

Fiscal year 2021:  
(A) New budget authority, \$34,961,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$34,313,000,000.

Fiscal year 2022:  
(A) New budget authority, \$35,720,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$35,038,000,000.

Fiscal year 2023:  
(A) New budget authority, \$36,516,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$35,812,000,000.

Fiscal year 2024:  
(A) New budget authority, \$37,318,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$36,580,000,000.

Fiscal year 2025:  
(A) New budget authority, \$38,151,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$37,393,000,000.

Fiscal year 2026:  
(A) New budget authority, \$39,021,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$38,238,000,000.

(4) **Energy (270):**  
Fiscal year 2017:  
(A) New budget authority, \$4,773,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$3,455,000,000.

Fiscal year 2018:  
(A) New budget authority, \$4,509,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$3,495,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019:  
(A) New budget authority, \$4,567,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$4,058,000,000.

Fiscal year 2020:  
(A) New budget authority, \$4,975,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$4,456,000,000.

Fiscal year 2021:  
(A) New budget authority, \$5,109,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$4,523,000,000.

Fiscal year 2022:  
(A) New budget authority, \$5,019,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$4,332,000,000.

Fiscal year 2023:  
(A) New budget authority, \$4,083,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$3,337,000,000.

Fiscal year 2024:  
(A) New budget authority, \$3,590,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$2,796,000,000.

Fiscal year 2025:  
(A) New budget authority, \$3,608,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$2,755,000,000.

Fiscal year 2026:  
(A) New budget authority, \$5,955,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$5,124,000,000.

(5) **Natural Resources and Environment (300):**

Fiscal year 2017:  
(A) New budget authority, \$41,264,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$42,254,000,000.

Fiscal year 2018:  
(A) New budget authority, \$43,738,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$44,916,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019:  
(A) New budget authority, \$44,486,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$45,425,000,000.

Fiscal year 2020:  
(A) New budget authority, \$46,201,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$46,647,000,000.

Fiscal year 2021:  
(A) New budget authority, \$47,126,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$47,457,000,000.

Fiscal year 2022:  
(A) New budget authority, \$48,203,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$48,388,000,000.

## Fiscal year 2023:

(A) New budget authority, \$49,403,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$49,536,000,000.

## Fiscal year 2024:

(A) New budget authority, \$50,497,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$50,055,000,000.

## Fiscal year 2025:

(A) New budget authority, \$51,761,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$51,164,000,000.

## Fiscal year 2026:

(A) New budget authority, \$53,017,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$51,915,000,000.

## (6) Agriculture (350):

## Fiscal year 2017:

(A) New budget authority, \$25,214,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$24,728,000,000.

## Fiscal year 2018:

(A) New budget authority, \$26,148,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$24,821,000,000.

## Fiscal year 2019:

(A) New budget authority, \$23,483,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$21,927,000,000.

## Fiscal year 2020:

(A) New budget authority, \$22,438,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$21,751,000,000.

## Fiscal year 2021:

(A) New budget authority, \$22,834,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$22,179,000,000.

## Fiscal year 2022:

(A) New budget authority, \$22,600,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$21,984,000,000.

## Fiscal year 2023:

(A) New budget authority, \$23,037,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$22,437,000,000.

## Fiscal year 2024:

(A) New budget authority, \$23,018,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$22,409,000,000.

## Fiscal year 2025:

(A) New budget authority, \$23,343,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$22,714,000,000.

## Fiscal year 2026:

(A) New budget authority, \$23,812,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$23,192,000,000.

## (7) Commerce and Housing Credit (370):

## Fiscal year 2017:

(A) New budget authority, \$14,696,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$666,000,000.

## Fiscal year 2018:

(A) New budget authority, \$16,846,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$1,378,000,000.

## Fiscal year 2019:

(A) New budget authority, \$18,171,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$5,439,000,000.

## Fiscal year 2020:

(A) New budget authority, \$15,799,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$2,666,000,000.

## Fiscal year 2021:

(A) New budget authority, \$14,821,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$915,000,000.

## Fiscal year 2022:

(A) New budget authority, \$15,408,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$674,000,000.

## Fiscal year 2023:

(A) New budget authority, \$15,739,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, — \$840,000,000.

## Fiscal year 2024:

(A) New budget authority, \$16,143,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, — \$1,688,000,000.

## Fiscal year 2025:

(A) New budget authority, \$17,889,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, — \$2,003,000,000.

## Fiscal year 2026:

(A) New budget authority, \$17,772,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, — \$2,238,000,000.

## (8) Transportation (400):

## Fiscal year 2017:

(A) New budget authority, \$92,782,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$91,684,000,000.

## Fiscal year 2018:

(A) New budget authority, \$94,400,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$93,214,000,000.

## Fiscal year 2019:

(A) New budget authority, \$96,522,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$95,683,000,000.

## Fiscal year 2020:

(A) New budget authority, \$91,199,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$97,992,000,000.

## Fiscal year 2021:

(A) New budget authority, \$92,154,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$99,772,000,000.

## Fiscal year 2022:

(A) New budget authority, \$93,111,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$101,692,000,000.

## Fiscal year 2023:

(A) New budget authority, \$94,118,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$103,431,000,000.

## Fiscal year 2024:

(A) New budget authority, \$95,143,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$105,313,000,000.

## Fiscal year 2025:

(A) New budget authority, \$96,209,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$107,374,000,000.

## Fiscal year 2026:

(A) New budget authority, \$97,323,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$109,188,000,000.

## (9) Community and Regional Development (450):

## Fiscal year 2017:

(A) New budget authority, \$19,723,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$22,477,000,000.

## Fiscal year 2018:

(A) New budget authority, \$19,228,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$21,277,000,000.

## Fiscal year 2019:

(A) New budget authority, \$19,457,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$20,862,000,000.

## Fiscal year 2020:

(A) New budget authority, \$19,941,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$20,011,000,000.

## Fiscal year 2021:

(A) New budget authority, \$20,384,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$21,048,000,000.

## Fiscal year 2022:

(A) New budget authority, \$20,825,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$19,831,000,000.

## Fiscal year 2023:

(A) New budget authority, \$21,288,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$19,535,000,000.

## Fiscal year 2024:

(A) New budget authority, \$21,756,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$19,787,000,000.

## Fiscal year 2025:

(A) New budget authority, \$22,245,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$19,285,000,000.

## Fiscal year 2026:

(A) New budget authority, \$22,751,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$20,037,000,000.

## (10) Education, Training, Employment, and Social Services (500):

## Fiscal year 2017:

(A) New budget authority, \$104,433,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$104,210,000,000.

## Fiscal year 2018:

(A) New budget authority, \$108,980,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$112,802,000,000.

## Fiscal year 2019:

(A) New budget authority, \$112,424,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$110,765,000,000.

## Fiscal year 2020:

(A) New budget authority, \$114,905,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$113,377,000,000.

## Fiscal year 2021:

(A) New budget authority, \$116,921,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$115,591,000,000.

## Fiscal year 2022:

(A) New budget authority, \$119,027,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$117,545,000,000.

## Fiscal year 2023:

(A) New budget authority, \$121,298,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$119,761,000,000.

## Fiscal year 2024:

(A) New budget authority, \$123,621,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$122,001,000,000.

## Fiscal year 2025:

(A) New budget authority, \$126,016,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$124,359,000,000.

## Fiscal year 2026:

(A) New budget authority, \$128,391,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$126,748,000,000.

## (11) Health (550):

## Fiscal year 2017:

(A) New budget authority, \$562,137,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$560,191,000,000.

## Fiscal year 2018:

(A) New budget authority, \$583,006,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$593,197,000,000.

## Fiscal year 2019:

(A) New budget authority, \$615,940,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$618,089,000,000.

## Fiscal year 2020:

(A) New budget authority, \$655,892,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$645,814,000,000.

## Fiscal year 2021:

(A) New budget authority, \$677,902,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$676,781,000,000.

## Fiscal year 2022:

(A) New budget authority, \$711,176,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$709,301,000,000.

## Fiscal year 2023:

(A) New budget authority, \$744,335,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$742,568,000,000.

## Fiscal year 2024:

(A) New budget authority, \$780,899,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$778,293,000,000.

## Fiscal year 2025:

(A) New budget authority, \$818,388,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$815,246,000,000.

## Fiscal year 2026:

(A) New budget authority, \$857,176,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$853,880,000,000.

## (12) Medicare (570):

## Fiscal year 2017:

(A) New budget authority, \$600,857,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$600,836,000,000.

## Fiscal year 2018:

(A) New budget authority, \$600,832,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$600,762,000,000.

## Fiscal year 2019:

(A) New budget authority, \$667,638,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$667,571,000,000.

## Fiscal year 2020:

(A) New budget authority, \$716,676,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$716,575,000,000.

## Fiscal year 2021:

(A) New budget authority, \$767,911,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$767,814,000,000.

## Fiscal year 2022:

(A) New budget authority, \$862,042,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$861,941,000,000.

## Fiscal year 2023:

(A) New budget authority, \$886,515,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$886,407,000,000.

## Fiscal year 2024:

(A) New budget authority, \$903,861,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$903,750,000,000.

## Fiscal year 2025:

(A) New budget authority, \$1,007,624,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$1,007,510,000,000.

## Fiscal year 2026:

(A) New budget authority, \$1,085,293,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$1,085,173,000,000.

## (13) Income Security (600):

## Fiscal year 2017:

(A) New budget authority, \$518,181,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$511,658,000,000.

## Fiscal year 2018:

(A) New budget authority, \$524,233,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$511,612,000,000.

## Fiscal year 2019:

(A) New budget authority, \$542,725,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$534,067,000,000.

## Fiscal year 2020:

(A) New budget authority, \$558,241,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$549,382,000,000.

## Fiscal year 2021:

(A) New budget authority, \$571,963,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$563,481,000,000.

## Fiscal year 2022:

(A) New budget authority, \$590,120,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$587,572,000,000.

## Fiscal year 2023:

(A) New budget authority, \$599,505,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$592,338,000,000.

## Fiscal year 2024:

(A) New budget authority, \$609,225,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$597,287,000,000.

## Fiscal year 2025:

(A) New budget authority, \$630,433,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$619,437,000,000.

## Fiscal year 2026:

(A) New budget authority, \$646,660,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$641,957,000,000.

## (14) Social Security (650):

## Fiscal year 2017:



(A) New budget authority, \$37,199,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$37,227,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2018:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$40,124,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$40,141,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2019:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$43,373,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$43,373,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2020:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$46,627,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$46,627,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2021:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$50,035,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$50,035,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2022:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$53,677,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$53,677,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2023:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$57,540,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$57,540,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2024:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$61,645,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$61,645,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2025:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$66,076,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$66,076,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2026:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$70,376,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$70,376,000,000.  
 (15) Veterans Benefits and Services (700):  
 Fiscal year 2017:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$177,448,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$182,448,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2018:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$178,478,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$179,109,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2019:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$193,088,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$192,198,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2020:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$199,907,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$198,833,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2021:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$206,700,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$205,667,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2022:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$223,542,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$222,308,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2023:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$221,861,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$220,563,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2024:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$219,382,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$218,147,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2025:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$237,641,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$236,254,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2026:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$245,565,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$244,228,000,000.  
 (16) Administration of Justice (750):  
 Fiscal year 2017:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$64,519,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$58,662,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2018:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$62,423,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$63,800,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2019:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$62,600,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$66,596,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2020:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$64,168,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$69,555,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2021:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$65,134,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$68,538,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2022:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$66,776,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$67,691,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2023:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$68,489,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$68,466,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2024:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$70,227,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$69,976,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2025:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$72,023,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$71,615,000,000.

Fiscal year 2026:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$79,932,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$80,205,000,000.  
 (17) General Government (800):  
 Fiscal year 2017:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$25,545,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$24,318,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2018:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$27,095,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$25,884,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2019:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$27,620,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$26,584,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2020:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$28,312,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$27,576,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2021:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$29,046,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$28,366,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2022:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$29,787,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$29,149,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2023:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$30,519,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$29,886,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2024:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$31,101,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$30,494,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2025:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$31,942,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$31,248,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2026:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$32,789,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$32,071,000,000.  
 (18) Net Interest (900):  
 Fiscal year 2017:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$393,295,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$393,295,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2018:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$453,250,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$453,250,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2019:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$526,618,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$526,618,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2020:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$590,571,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$590,571,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2021:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$645,719,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$645,719,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2022:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$698,101,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$698,101,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2023:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$755,288,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$755,288,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2024:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$806,202,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$806,202,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2025:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$854,104,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$854,104,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2026:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$903,443,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$903,443,000,000.  
 (19) Allowances (920):  
 Fiscal year 2017:  
 (A) New budget authority, —\$3,849,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$7,627,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2018:  
 (A) New budget authority, —\$56,166,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, —\$39,329,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2019:  
 (A) New budget authority, —\$55,423,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, —\$47,614,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2020:  
 (A) New budget authority, —\$58,021,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, —\$52,831,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2021:  
 (A) New budget authority, —\$61,491,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, —\$57,092,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2022:  
 (A) New budget authority, —\$63,493,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, —\$60,260,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2023:  
 (A) New budget authority, —\$65,783,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, —\$62,457,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2024:

(A) New budget authority, —\$67,817,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, —\$64,708,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2025:  
 (A) New budget authority, —\$70,127,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, —\$66,892,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2026:  
 (A) New budget authority, —\$69,097,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, —\$68,467,000,000.  
 (20) Undistributed Offsetting Receipts (950):  
 Fiscal year 2017:  
 (A) New budget authority, —\$87,685,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, —\$87,685,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2018:  
 (A) New budget authority, —\$88,347,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, —\$88,347,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2019:  
 (A) New budget authority, —\$80,125,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, —\$80,125,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2020:  
 (A) New budget authority, —\$81,468,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, —\$81,468,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2021:  
 (A) New budget authority, —\$84,183,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, —\$84,183,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2022:  
 (A) New budget authority, —\$86,292,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, —\$86,292,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2023:  
 (A) New budget authority, —\$87,518,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, —\$87,518,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2024:  
 (A) New budget authority, —\$91,245,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, —\$91,245,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2025:  
 (A) New budget authority, —\$99,164,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, —\$99,164,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2026:  
 (A) New budget authority, —\$97,786,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, —\$97,786,000,000.

#### Subtitle B—Levels and Amounts in the Senate

##### SEC. 1201. SOCIAL SECURITY IN THE SENATE.

(a) SOCIAL SECURITY REVENUES.—For purposes of Senate enforcement under sections 302 and 311 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 633 and 642), the amounts of revenues of the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund and the Federal Disability Insurance Trust Fund are as follows:

Fiscal year 2017: \$826,048,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2018: \$857,618,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2019: \$886,810,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2020: \$918,110,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2021: \$950,341,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2022: \$984,537,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2023: \$1,020,652,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2024: \$1,058,799,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2025: \$1,097,690,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2026: \$1,138,243,000,000.

(b) SOCIAL SECURITY OUTLAYS.—For purposes of Senate enforcement under sections 302 and 311 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 633 and 642), the amounts of outlays of the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund and the Federal Disability Insurance Trust Fund are as follows:

Fiscal year 2017: \$805,366,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2018: \$857,840,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2019: \$916,764,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2020: \$980,634,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2021: \$1,049,127,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2022: \$1,123,266,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2023: \$1,200,734,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2024: \$1,281,840,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2025: \$1,369,403,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2026: \$1,463,057,000,000.

(c) SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES.—In the Senate, the amounts of new budget authority and budget outlays of the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund and the Federal Disability Insurance Trust Fund for administrative expenses are as follows:

Fiscal year 2017:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$5,663,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$5,673,000,000.

Fiscal year 2018:

(A) New budget authority, \$6,021,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$5,987,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019:

(A) New budget authority, \$6,205,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$6,170,000,000.

Fiscal year 2020:

(A) New budget authority, \$6,393,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$6,357,000,000.

Fiscal year 2021:

(A) New budget authority, \$6,589,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$6,552,000,000.

Fiscal year 2022:

(A) New budget authority, \$6,787,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$6,750,000,000.

Fiscal year 2023:

(A) New budget authority, \$6,992,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$6,953,000,000.

Fiscal year 2024:

(A) New budget authority, \$7,206,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$7,166,000,000.

Fiscal year 2025:

(A) New budget authority, \$7,428,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$7,387,000,000.

Fiscal year 2026:

(A) New budget authority, \$7,659,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$7,615,000,000.

#### **SEC. 1202. POSTAL SERVICE DISCRETIONARY ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES IN THE SENATE.**

In the Senate, the amounts of new budget authority and budget outlays of the Postal Service for discretionary administrative expenses are as follows:

Fiscal year 2017:

(A) New budget authority, \$274,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$273,000,000.

Fiscal year 2018:

(A) New budget authority, \$283,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$283,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019:

(A) New budget authority, \$294,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$294,000,000.

Fiscal year 2020:

(A) New budget authority, \$304,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$304,000,000.

Fiscal year 2021:

(A) New budget authority, \$315,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$315,000,000.

Fiscal year 2022:

(A) New budget authority, \$326,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$325,000,000.

Fiscal year 2023:

(A) New budget authority, \$337,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$337,000,000.

Fiscal year 2024:

(A) New budget authority, \$350,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$349,000,000.

Fiscal year 2025:

(A) New budget authority, \$361,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$360,000,000.

Fiscal year 2026:

(A) New budget authority, \$374,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$373,000,000.

#### **TITLE II—RECONCILIATION**

##### **SEC. 2001. RECONCILIATION IN THE SENATE.**

(a) COMMITTEE ON FINANCE.—The Committee on Finance of the Senate shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction to reduce the deficit by not less than \$1,000,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2017 through 2026.

(b) COMMITTEE ON HEALTH, EDUCATION, LABOR, AND PENSIONS.—The Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions of the Senate shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction to reduce the deficit by not less than \$1,000,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2017 through 2026.

(c) SUBMISSIONS.—In the Senate, not later than January 27, 2017, the Committees named in subsections (a) and (b) shall submit their recommendations to the Committee on the Budget of the Senate. Upon receiving all such recommendations, the Committee on the Budget of the Senate shall report to the Senate a reconciliation bill carrying out all

such recommendations without any substantive revision.

##### **SEC. 2002. RECONCILIATION IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.**

(a) COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND COMMERCE.—The Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives shall submit changes in laws within its jurisdiction to reduce the deficit by not less than \$1,000,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2017 through 2026.

(b) COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS.—The Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives shall submit changes in laws within its jurisdiction to reduce the deficit by not less than \$1,000,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2017 through 2026.

(c) SUBMISSIONS.—In the House of Representatives, not later than January 27, 2017, the committees named in subsections (a) and (b) shall submit their recommendations to the Committee on the Budget of the House of Representatives to carry out this section.

#### **TITLE III—RESERVE FUNDS**

##### **SEC. 3001. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR HEALTH CARE LEGISLATION.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate and the Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the House of Representatives may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and, in the Senate, make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for—

(1) in the Senate, one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, conference reports, or motions related to health care by the amounts provided in such legislation for that purpose, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over the period of the total of fiscal years 2017 through 2026; and

(2) in the House of Representatives, one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, or conference reports related to health care by the amounts provided in such legislation for that purpose, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over the period of the total of fiscal years 2017 through 2026.

##### **SEC. 3002. RESERVE FUND FOR HEALTH CARE LEGISLATION.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate and the Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the House of Representatives may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and, in the Senate, make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for—

(1) in the Senate, one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, conference reports, or motions related to health care by the amounts necessary to accommodate the budgetary effects of the legislation, provided that the cost of such legislation, when combined with the cost of any other measure with respect to which the Chairman has exercised the authority under this paragraph, does not exceed the difference obtained by subtracting—

(A) \$2,000,000,000; from

(B) the sum of deficit reduction over the period of the total of fiscal years 2017 through 2026 achieved under any measure or measures with respect to which the Chairman has exercised the authority under section 3001(1); and

(2) in the House of Representatives, one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, or conference reports related to health care by the amounts necessary to accommodate the budgetary effects of the legislation, provided that the cost of such legislation, when combined with the cost of any other measure with respect to which the Chairman has ex-

ercised the authority under this paragraph, does not exceed the difference obtained by subtracting—

(A) \$2,000,000,000; from

(B) the sum of deficit reduction over the period of the total of fiscal years 2017 through 2026 achieved under any measure or measures with respect to which the Chairman has exercised the authority under section 3001(2).

(b) EXCEPTIONS FROM CERTAIN PROVISIONS.—Section 404(a) of S. Con. Res. 13 (111th Congress), the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2010, and section 3101 of S. Con. Res. 11 (114th Congress), the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2016, shall not apply to legislation for which the Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the applicable House has exercised the authority under subsection (a).

#### **TITLE IV—OTHER MATTERS**

##### **SEC. 4001. ENFORCEMENT FILING.**

(a) IN THE SENATE.—If this concurrent resolution on the budget is agreed to by the Senate and House of Representatives without the appointment of a committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses, the Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may submit a statement for publication in the Congressional Record containing—

(1) for the Committee on Appropriations, committee allocations for fiscal year 2017 consistent with the levels in title I for the purpose of enforcing section 302 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 633); and

(2) for all committees other than the Committee on Appropriations, committee allocations for fiscal years 2017, 2017 through 2021, and 2017 through 2026 consistent with the levels in title I for the purpose of enforcing section 302 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 633).

(b) IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.—In the House of Representatives, if a concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2017 is adopted without the appointment of a committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses with respect to this concurrent resolution on the budget, for the purpose of enforcing the Congressional Budget Act and applicable rules and requirements set forth in the concurrent resolution on the budget, the allocations provided for in this subsection shall apply in the House of Representatives in the same manner as if such allocations were in a joint explanatory statement accompanying a conference report on the budget for fiscal year 2017. The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the House of Representatives shall submit a statement for publication in the Congressional Record containing—

(1) for the Committee on Appropriations, committee allocations for fiscal year 2017 consistent with title I for the purpose of enforcing section 302 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 633); and

(2) for all committees other than the Committee on Appropriations, committee allocations consistent with title I for fiscal year 2017 and for the period of fiscal years 2017 through 2026 for the purpose of enforcing section 302 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 633).

##### **SEC. 4002. BUDGETARY TREATMENT OF ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding section 302(a)(1) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 633(a)(1)), section 13301 of the Budget Enforcement Act of 1990 (2 U.S.C. 632 note), and section 2009a of title 39, United States Code, the report accompanying this concurrent resolution on the budget, the joint explanatory statement accompanying the conference report on any concurrent resolution on the budget, or a statement filed

under section 4001 shall include in an allocation under section 302(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 to the Committee on Appropriations of the applicable House of Congress amounts for the discretionary administrative expenses of the Social Security Administration and the United States Postal Service.

(b) **SPECIAL RULE.**—In the Senate and the House of Representatives, for purposes of enforcing section 302(f) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 633(f)), estimates of the level of total new budget authority and total outlays provided by a measure shall include any discretionary amounts described in subsection (a).

**SEC. 4003. APPLICATION AND EFFECT OF CHANGES IN ALLOCATIONS AND AGGREGATES.**

(a) **APPLICATION.**—Any adjustments of allocations and aggregates made pursuant to this concurrent resolution shall—

(1) apply while that measure is under consideration;

(2) take effect upon the enactment of that measure; and

(3) be published in the Congressional Record as soon as practicable.

(b) **EFFECT OF CHANGED ALLOCATIONS AND AGGREGATES.**—Revised allocations and aggregates resulting from these adjustments shall be considered for the purposes of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 621 et seq.) as the allocations and aggregates contained in this concurrent resolution.

(c) **BUDGET COMMITTEE DETERMINATIONS.**—For purposes of this concurrent resolution, the levels of new budget authority, outlays, direct spending, new entitlement authority, revenues, deficits, and surpluses for a fiscal year or period of fiscal years shall be determined on the basis of estimates made by the Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the applicable House of Congress.

(d) **AGGREGATES, ALLOCATIONS AND APPLICATION.**—In the House of Representatives, for purposes of this concurrent resolution and budget enforcement, the consideration of any bill or joint resolution, or amendment thereto or conference report thereon, for which the Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the House of Representatives makes adjustments or revisions in the allocations, aggregates, and other budgetary levels of this concurrent resolution shall not be subject to the points of order set forth in clause 10 of rule XXI of the Rules of the House of Representatives or section 3101 of S. Con. Res. 11 (114th Congress).

**SEC. 4004. EXERCISE OF RULEMAKING POWERS.**

Congress adopts the provisions of this title—

(1) as an exercise of the rulemaking power of the Senate and the House of Representatives, respectively, and as such they shall be considered as part of the rules of each House or of that House to which they specifically apply, and such rules shall supersede other rules only to the extent that they are inconsistent with such other rules; and

(2) with full recognition of the constitutional right of either the Senate or the House of Representatives to change those rules (insofar as they relate to that House) at any time, in the same manner, and to the same extent as is the case of any other rule of the Senate or House of Representatives.

The CHAIR. No amendment shall be in order except the amendment printed House Report 115-4.

Such amendment may be offered only by the Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, and shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. YARMUTH

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 1 printed in House Report 115-4.

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Strike all after the resolving clause and insert the following:

**SECTION 1. CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2017.**

(a) **DECLARATION.**—Congress declares that this resolution is the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2017 and that this resolution sets forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2018 through 2026.

(b) **TABLE OF CONTENTS.**—The table of contents for this concurrent resolution is as follows:

Sec. 1. Concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2017.

**TITLE I—RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS**

**Subtitle A—Budgetary Levels in Both Houses**

Sec. 1101. Recommended levels and amounts.

Sec. 1102. Major functional categories.

**Subtitle B—Levels and Amounts in the Senate**

Sec. 1201. Social Security in the Senate.

Sec. 1202. Postal Service discretionary administrative expenses in the Senate.

**TITLE II—RESERVE FUND**

Sec. 2001. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for job creation, infrastructure investment, and tax reform.

**TITLE III—OTHER MATTERS**

Sec. 3001. Budgetary treatment of administrative expenses.

Sec. 3002. Application and effect of changes in allocations and aggregates.

Sec. 3003. Exercise of rulemaking powers.

**TITLE I—RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS**

**Subtitle A—Budgetary Levels in Both Houses**

**SEC. 1101. RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS.**

The following budgetary levels are appropriate for each of fiscal years 2017 through 2026:

(1) **FEDERAL REVENUES.**—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution:

(A) The recommended levels of Federal revenues are as follows:

Fiscal year 2017: \$2,682,088,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2018: \$2,787,834,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2019: \$2,884,637,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2020: \$3,012,645,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2021: \$3,131,369,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2022: \$3,262,718,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2023: \$3,402,888,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2024: \$3,556,097,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2025: \$3,727,756,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2026: \$3,903,628,000,000.

(B) The amounts by which the aggregate levels of Federal revenues should be changed are as follows:

Fiscal year 2017: \$0.  
Fiscal year 2018: \$0.  
Fiscal year 2019: \$0.  
Fiscal year 2020: \$0.  
Fiscal year 2021: \$0.  
Fiscal year 2022: \$0.  
Fiscal year 2023: \$0.  
Fiscal year 2024: \$0.  
Fiscal year 2025: \$0.  
Fiscal year 2026: \$0.

(2) **NEW BUDGET AUTHORITY.**—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the appropriate levels of total new budget authority are as follows:

Fiscal year 2017: \$3,308,000,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2018: \$3,350,010,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2019: \$3,590,479,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2020: \$3,779,449,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2021: \$3,947,834,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2022: \$4,187,893,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2023: \$4,336,952,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2024: \$4,473,818,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2025: \$4,726,484,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2026: \$4,963,189,000,000.

(3) **BUDGET OUTLAYS.**—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the appropriate levels of total budget outlays are as follows:

Fiscal year 2017: \$3,264,662,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2018: \$3,329,394,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2019: \$3,558,237,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2020: \$3,741,304,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2021: \$3,916,533,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2022: \$4,159,803,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2023: \$4,295,742,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2024: \$4,419,330,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2025: \$4,673,813,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2026: \$4,914,240,000,000.

(4) **DEFICITS.**—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the amounts of the deficits are as follows:

Fiscal year 2017: \$582,574,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2018: \$541,560,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2019: \$673,600,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2020: \$728,659,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2021: \$785,164,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2022: \$897,085,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2023: \$892,854,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2024: \$863,233,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2025: \$946,057,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2026: \$1,010,612,000,000.

(5) **PUBLIC DEBT.**—Pursuant to section 301(a)(5) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 632(a)(5)), the appropriate levels of the public debt are as follows:

Fiscal year 2017: \$20,034,788,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2018: \$20,784,183,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2019: \$21,625,729,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2020: \$22,504,763,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2021: \$23,440,271,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2022: \$24,509,421,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2023: \$25,605,527,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2024: \$26,701,273,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2025: \$27,869,175,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2026: \$29,128,193,000,000.

(6) **DEBT HELD BY THE PUBLIC.**—The appropriate levels of debt held by the public are as follows:

Fiscal year 2017: \$14,593,316,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2018: \$15,198,740,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2019: \$15,955,144,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2020: \$16,791,740,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2021: \$17,713,599,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2022: \$18,787,230,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2023: \$19,901,290,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2024: \$21,033,163,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2025: \$22,301,661,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2026: \$23,693,879,000,000.

**SEC. 1102. MAJOR FUNCTIONAL CATEGORIES.**

Congress determines and declares that the appropriate levels of new budget authority and outlays for fiscal years 2017 through 2026 for each major functional category are:

(1) **National Defense (050):**

Fiscal year 2017:

(A) New budget authority, \$623,910,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$603,716,000,000.

Fiscal year 2018:

(A) New budget authority, \$618,347,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$601,646,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019:

(A) New budget authority, \$632,742,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$617,943,000,000.

Fiscal year 2020:

(A) New budget authority, \$648,198,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$632,435,000,000.

Fiscal year 2021:

<p>(A) New budget authority, \$663,703,000,000. (B) Outlays, \$646,853,000,000. Fiscal year 2022: (A) New budget authority, \$679,968,000,000. (B) Outlays, \$666,926,000,000. Fiscal year 2023: (A) New budget authority, \$696,578,000,000. (B) Outlays, \$678,139,000,000. Fiscal year 2024: (A) New budget authority, \$713,664,000,000. (B) Outlays, \$689,531,000,000. Fiscal year 2025: (A) New budget authority, \$731,228,000,000. (B) Outlays, \$711,423,000,000. Fiscal year 2026: (A) New budget authority, \$750,069,000,000. (B) Outlays, \$729,616,000,000. (2) International Affairs (150): Fiscal year 2017: (A) New budget authority, \$61,996,000,000. (B) Outlays, \$51,907,000,000. Fiscal year 2018: (A) New budget authority, \$60,099,000,000. (B) Outlays, \$53,541,000,000. Fiscal year 2019: (A) New budget authority, \$61,097,000,000. (B) Outlays, \$55,800,000,000. Fiscal year 2020: (A) New budget authority, \$60,686,000,000. (B) Outlays, \$57,690,000,000. Fiscal year 2021: (A) New budget authority, \$61,085,000,000. (B) Outlays, \$58,756,000,000. Fiscal year 2022: (A) New budget authority, \$62,576,000,000. (B) Outlays, \$60,205,000,000. Fiscal year 2023: (A) New budget authority, \$64,141,000,000. (B) Outlays, \$61,513,000,000. Fiscal year 2024: (A) New budget authority, \$65,588,000,000. (B) Outlays, \$62,705,000,000. Fiscal year 2025: (A) New budget authority, \$67,094,000,000. (B) Outlays, \$63,915,000,000. Fiscal year 2026: (A) New budget authority, \$68,692,000,000. (B) Outlays, \$65,305,000,000. (3) General Science, Space, and Technology (250): Fiscal year 2017: (A) New budget authority, \$31,562,000,000. (B) Outlays, \$30,988,000,000. Fiscal year 2018: (A) New budget authority, \$32,787,000,000. (B) Outlays, \$32,225,000,000. Fiscal year 2019: (A) New budget authority, \$33,476,000,000. (B) Outlays, \$32,978,000,000. Fiscal year 2020: (A) New budget authority, \$34,202,000,000. (B) Outlays, \$33,645,000,000. Fiscal year 2021: (A) New budget authority, \$34,961,000,000. (B) Outlays, \$34,313,000,000. Fiscal year 2022: (A) New budget authority, \$35,720,000,000. (B) Outlays, \$35,038,000,000. Fiscal year 2023: (A) New budget authority, \$36,516,000,000. (B) Outlays, \$35,812,000,000. Fiscal year 2024: (A) New budget authority, \$37,318,000,000. (B) Outlays, \$36,580,000,000. Fiscal year 2025: (A) New budget authority, \$38,151,000,000. (B) Outlays, \$37,393,000,000. Fiscal year 2026: (A) New budget authority, \$39,021,000,000. (B) Outlays, \$38,238,000,000. (4) Energy (270): Fiscal year 2017: (A) New budget authority, \$4,773,000,000. (B) Outlays, \$3,455,000,000. Fiscal year 2018: (A) New budget authority, \$4,509,000,000. (B) Outlays, \$3,495,000,000. Fiscal year 2019:</p>	<p>(A) New budget authority, \$4,567,000,000. (B) Outlays, \$4,058,000,000. Fiscal year 2020: (A) New budget authority, \$4,975,000,000. (B) Outlays, \$4,456,000,000. Fiscal year 2021: (A) New budget authority, \$5,109,000,000. (B) Outlays, \$4,523,000,000. Fiscal year 2022: (A) New budget authority, \$5,019,000,000. (B) Outlays, \$4,332,000,000. Fiscal year 2023: (A) New budget authority, \$4,083,000,000. (B) Outlays, \$3,337,000,000. Fiscal year 2024: (A) New budget authority, \$3,590,000,000. (B) Outlays, \$2,796,000,000. Fiscal year 2025: (A) New budget authority, \$3,608,000,000. (B) Outlays, \$2,755,000,000. Fiscal year 2026: (A) New budget authority, \$5,955,000,000. (B) Outlays, \$5,124,000,000. (5) Natural Resources and Environment (300): Fiscal year 2017: (A) New budget authority, \$41,264,000,000. (B) Outlays, \$42,254,000,000. Fiscal year 2018: (A) New budget authority, \$43,738,000,000. (B) Outlays, \$44,916,000,000. Fiscal year 2019: (A) New budget authority, \$44,486,000,000. (B) Outlays, \$45,425,000,000. Fiscal year 2020: (A) New budget authority, \$46,201,000,000. (B) Outlays, \$46,647,000,000. Fiscal year 2021: (A) New budget authority, \$47,126,000,000. (B) Outlays, \$47,457,000,000. Fiscal year 2022: (A) New budget authority, \$48,203,000,000. (B) Outlays, \$48,388,000,000. Fiscal year 2023: (A) New budget authority, \$49,403,000,000. (B) Outlays, \$49,536,000,000. Fiscal year 2024: (A) New budget authority, \$50,497,000,000. (B) Outlays, \$50,055,000,000. Fiscal year 2025: (A) New budget authority, \$51,761,000,000. (B) Outlays, \$51,164,000,000. Fiscal year 2026: (A) New budget authority, \$53,017,000,000. (B) Outlays, \$51,915,000,000. (6) Agriculture (350): Fiscal year 2017: (A) New budget authority, \$25,214,000,000. (B) Outlays, \$24,728,000,000. Fiscal year 2018: (A) New budget authority, \$26,148,000,000. (B) Outlays, \$24,821,000,000. Fiscal year 2019: (A) New budget authority, \$23,483,000,000. (B) Outlays, \$21,927,000,000. Fiscal year 2020: (A) New budget authority, \$22,438,000,000. (B) Outlays, \$21,751,000,000. Fiscal year 2021: (A) New budget authority, \$22,834,000,000. (B) Outlays, \$22,179,000,000. Fiscal year 2022: (A) New budget authority, \$22,600,000,000. (B) Outlays, \$21,984,000,000. Fiscal year 2023: (A) New budget authority, \$23,037,000,000. (B) Outlays, \$22,437,000,000. Fiscal year 2024: (A) New budget authority, \$23,018,000,000. (B) Outlays, \$22,409,000,000. Fiscal year 2025: (A) New budget authority, \$23,343,000,000. (B) Outlays, \$22,714,000,000. Fiscal year 2026: (A) New budget authority, \$23,812,000,000. (B) Outlays, \$23,192,000,000. (7) Commerce and Housing Credit (370): Fiscal year 2017:</p>	<p>(A) New budget authority, \$14,696,000,000. (B) Outlays, \$666,000,000. Fiscal year 2018: (A) New budget authority, \$16,846,000,000. (B) Outlays, \$1,378,000,000. Fiscal year 2019: (A) New budget authority, \$18,171,000,000. (B) Outlays, \$5,439,000,000. Fiscal year 2020: (A) New budget authority, \$15,799,000,000. (B) Outlays, \$2,666,000,000. Fiscal year 2021: (A) New budget authority, \$14,821,000,000. (B) Outlays, \$915,000,000. Fiscal year 2022: (A) New budget authority, \$15,408,000,000. (B) Outlays, \$674,000,000. Fiscal year 2023: (A) New budget authority, \$15,739,000,000. (B) Outlays, — \$840,000,000. Fiscal year 2024: (A) New budget authority, \$16,143,000,000. (B) Outlays, — \$1,688,000,000. Fiscal year 2025: (A) New budget authority, \$17,889,000,000. (B) Outlays, — \$2,003,000,000. Fiscal year 2026: (A) New budget authority, \$17,772,000,000. (B) Outlays, — \$2,238,000,000. (8) Transportation (400): Fiscal year 2017: (A) New budget authority, \$92,782,000,000. (B) Outlays, \$91,684,000,000. Fiscal year 2018: (A) New budget authority, \$94,400,000,000. (B) Outlays, \$93,214,000,000. Fiscal year 2019: (A) New budget authority, \$96,522,000,000. (B) Outlays, \$95,683,000,000. Fiscal year 2020: (A) New budget authority, \$91,199,000,000. (B) Outlays, \$97,992,000,000. Fiscal year 2021: (A) New budget authority, \$92,154,000,000. (B) Outlays, \$99,772,000,000. Fiscal year 2022: (A) New budget authority, \$93,111,000,000. (B) Outlays, \$101,692,000,000. Fiscal year 2023: (A) New budget authority, \$94,118,000,000. (B) Outlays, \$103,431,000,000. Fiscal year 2024: (A) New budget authority, \$95,143,000,000. (B) Outlays, \$105,313,000,000. Fiscal year 2025: (A) New budget authority, \$96,209,000,000. (B) Outlays, \$107,374,000,000. Fiscal year 2026: (A) New budget authority, \$97,323,000,000. (B) Outlays, \$109,188,000,000. (9) Community and Regional Development (450): Fiscal year 2017: (A) New budget authority, \$19,723,000,000. (B) Outlays, \$22,477,000,000. Fiscal year 2018: (A) New budget authority, \$19,228,000,000. (B) Outlays, \$21,277,000,000. Fiscal year 2019: (A) New budget authority, \$19,457,000,000. (B) Outlays, \$20,862,000,000. Fiscal year 2020: (A) New budget authority, \$19,941,000,000. (B) Outlays, \$20,011,000,000. Fiscal year 2021: (A) New budget authority, \$20,384,000,000. (B) Outlays, \$21,048,000,000. Fiscal year 2022: (A) New budget authority, \$20,825,000,000. (B) Outlays, \$19,831,000,000. Fiscal year 2023: (A) New budget authority, \$21,288,000,000. (B) Outlays, \$19,535,000,000. Fiscal year 2024: (A) New budget authority, \$21,756,000,000. (B) Outlays, \$19,787,000,000. Fiscal year 2025: (A) New budget authority, \$22,245,000,000.</p>
---	---	---

(B) Outlays, \$19,285,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2026:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$22,751,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$20,037,000,000.  
 (10) Education, Training, Employment, and Social Services (500):  
 Fiscal year 2017:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$104,433,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$104,210,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2018:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$108,980,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$112,802,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2019:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$112,424,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$110,765,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2020:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$114,905,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$113,377,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2021:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$116,921,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$115,591,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2022:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$119,027,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$117,545,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2023:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$121,298,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$119,761,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2024:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$123,621,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$122,001,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2025:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$126,016,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$124,359,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2026:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$128,391,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$126,748,000,000.  
 (11) Health (550):  
 Fiscal year 2017:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$562,137,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$560,191,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2018:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$583,006,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$593,197,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2019:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$615,940,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$618,089,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2020:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$655,892,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$645,814,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2021:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$677,902,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$676,781,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2022:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$711,176,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$709,301,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2023:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$744,335,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$742,568,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2024:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$780,899,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$778,293,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2025:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$818,388,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$815,246,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2026:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$857,176,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$853,880,000,000.  
 (12) Medicare (570):  
 Fiscal year 2017:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$600,857,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$600,836,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2018:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$600,832,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$600,762,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2019:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$667,638,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$667,571,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2020:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$716,676,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$716,575,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2021:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$767,911,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$767,814,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2022:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$862,042,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$861,941,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2023:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$886,515,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$886,407,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2024:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$903,861,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$903,750,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2025:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$1,007,624,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$1,007,510,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2026:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$1,085,293,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$1,085,173,000,000.  
 (13) Income Security (600):  
 Fiscal year 2017:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$518,181,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$511,658,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2018:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$524,233,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$511,612,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2019:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$542,725,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$534,067,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2020:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$558,241,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$549,382,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2021:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$571,963,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$563,481,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2022:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$590,120,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$587,572,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2023:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$599,505,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$592,338,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2024:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$609,225,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$597,287,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2025:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$630,433,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$619,437,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2026:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$646,660,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$641,957,000,000.  
 (14) Social Security (650):  
 Fiscal year 2017:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$37,199,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$37,227,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2018:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$40,124,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$40,141,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2019:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$43,373,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$43,373,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2020:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$46,627,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$46,627,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2021:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$50,035,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$50,035,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2022:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$53,677,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$53,677,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2023:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$57,540,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$57,540,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2024:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$61,645,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$61,645,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2025:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$66,076,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$66,076,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2026:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$70,376,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$70,376,000,000.  
 (15) Veterans Benefits and Services (700):  
 Fiscal year 2017:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$177,448,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$182,448,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2018:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$178,478,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$179,109,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2019:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$193,088,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$192,198,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2020:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$199,907,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$198,833,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2021:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$206,700,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$205,667,000,000.

Fiscal year 2022:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$223,542,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$222,308,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2023:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$221,861,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$220,563,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2024:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$219,382,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$218,147,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2025:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$237,641,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$236,254,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2026:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$245,565,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$244,228,000,000.  
 (16) Administration of Justice (750):  
 Fiscal year 2017:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$64,519,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$58,662,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2018:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$62,423,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$63,800,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2019:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$62,600,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$66,596,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2020:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$64,168,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$69,555,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2021:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$65,134,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$68,538,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2022:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$66,776,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$67,691,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2023:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$68,489,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$68,466,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2024:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$70,227,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$69,976,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2025:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$72,023,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$71,615,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2026:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$79,932,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$80,205,000,000.  
 (17) General Government (800):  
 Fiscal year 2017:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$25,545,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$24,318,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2018:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$27,095,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$25,884,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2019:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$27,620,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$26,584,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2020:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$28,312,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$27,576,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2021:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$29,046,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$28,366,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2022:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$29,787,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$29,149,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2023:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$30,519,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$29,886,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2024:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$31,101,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$30,494,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2025:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$31,942,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$31,248,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2026:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$32,789,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$32,071,000,000.  
 (18) Net Interest (900):  
 Fiscal year 2017:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$393,295,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$393,295,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2018:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$453,250,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$453,250,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2019:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$526,618,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$526,618,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2020:

(A) New budget authority, \$590,571,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$590,571,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2021:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$645,719,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$645,719,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2022:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$698,101,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$698,101,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2023:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$755,288,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$755,288,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2024:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$806,202,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$806,202,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2025:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$854,104,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$854,104,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2026:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$903,478,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$903,478,000,000.  
 (19) Allowances (920):  
 Fiscal year 2017:  
 (A) New budget authority, —\$3,849,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$7,627,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2018:  
 (A) New budget authority, —\$56,166,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, —\$39,329,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2019:  
 (A) New budget authority, —\$55,423,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, —\$47,614,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2020:  
 (A) New budget authority, —\$58,021,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, —\$52,831,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2021:  
 (A) New budget authority, —\$61,491,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, —\$57,092,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2022:  
 (A) New budget authority, —\$63,493,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, —\$60,260,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2023:  
 (A) New budget authority, —\$65,783,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, —\$62,457,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2024:  
 (A) New budget authority, —\$67,817,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, —\$64,708,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2025:  
 (A) New budget authority, —\$70,127,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, —\$66,892,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2026:  
 (A) New budget authority, —\$71,097,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, —\$70,467,000,000.  
 (20) Undistributed Offsetting Receipts (950):  
 Fiscal year 2017:  
 (A) New budget authority, —\$87,685,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, —\$87,685,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2018:  
 (A) New budget authority, —\$88,347,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, —\$88,347,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2019:  
 (A) New budget authority, —\$80,125,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, —\$80,125,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2020:  
 (A) New budget authority, —\$81,468,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, —\$81,468,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2021:  
 (A) New budget authority, —\$84,183,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, —\$84,183,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2022:  
 (A) New budget authority, —\$86,292,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, —\$86,292,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2023:  
 (A) New budget authority, —\$87,518,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, —\$87,518,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2024:  
 (A) New budget authority, —\$91,245,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, —\$91,245,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2025:  
 (A) New budget authority, —\$99,164,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, —\$99,164,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2026:  
 (A) New budget authority, —\$97,786,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, —\$97,786,000,000.

#### Subtitle B—Levels and Amounts in the Senate

#### SEC. 1201. SOCIAL SECURITY IN THE SENATE.

(a) SOCIAL SECURITY REVENUES.—For purposes of Senate enforcement under sections

302 and 311 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 633 and 642), the amounts of revenues of the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund and the Federal Disability Insurance Trust Fund are as follows:

Fiscal year 2017: \$826,048,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2018: \$857,618,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2019: \$886,810,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2020: \$918,110,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2021: \$950,341,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2022: \$984,537,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2023: \$1,020,652,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2024: \$1,058,799,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2025: \$1,097,690,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2026: \$1,138,243,000,000.

(b) SOCIAL SECURITY OUTLAYS.—For purposes of Senate enforcement under sections 302 and 311 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 633 and 642), the amounts of outlays of the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund and the Federal Disability Insurance Trust Fund are as follows:

Fiscal year 2017: \$805,366,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2018: \$857,840,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2019: \$916,764,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2020: \$980,634,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2021: \$1,049,127,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2022: \$1,123,266,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2023: \$1,200,734,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2024: \$1,281,840,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2025: \$1,369,403,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2026: \$1,463,057,000,000.

(c) SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES.—In the Senate, the amounts of new budget authority and budget outlays of the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund and the Federal Disability Insurance Trust Fund for administrative expenses are as follows:

Fiscal year 2017:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$5,663,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$5,673,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2018:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$6,021,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$5,987,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2019:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$6,205,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$6,170,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2020:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$6,393,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$6,357,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2021:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$6,589,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$6,552,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2022:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$6,787,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$6,750,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2023:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$6,992,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$6,953,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2024:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$7,206,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$7,166,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2025:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$7,428,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$7,387,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2026:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$7,659,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$7,615,000,000.

#### SEC. 1202. POSTAL SERVICE DISCRETIONARY ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES IN THE SENATE.

In the Senate, the amounts of new budget authority and budget outlays of the Postal Service for discretionary administrative expenses are as follows:

Fiscal year 2017:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$274,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$273,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2018:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$283,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$283,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2019:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$294,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$294,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2020:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$304,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$304,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2021:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$315,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$315,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2022:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$326,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$325,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2023:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$337,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$337,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2024:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$350,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$349,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2025:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$361,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$360,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2026:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$374,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$373,000,000.

#### TITLE II—RESERVE FUND

#### SEC. 2001. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR JOB CREATION, INFRASTRUCTURE INVESTMENT, AND TAX REFORM.

In the House of Representatives, the chair of the Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for any bill, joint resolution, amendment, or conference report that provide job creation through robust Federal investments in America's infrastructure and reforming the tax code to provide relief for American families. The revisions may be made for any measure that—

(1) provides for additional investments in highways, public transit, rail, aviation, harbors, seaports, inland waterway systems, public housing, broadband, energy, water, and other job-creating infrastructure improvements, and

(2) reforms the tax code to support hard-working American families; by the amounts provided in such measure if such measure does not increase the deficit for either of the following time periods: fiscal year 2017 to fiscal year 2021 or fiscal year 2017 to fiscal year 2026.

#### TITLE III—OTHER MATTERS

#### SEC. 3001. BUDGETARY TREATMENT OF ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding section 302(a)(1) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 633(a)(1)), section 13301 of the Budget Enforcement Act of 1990 (2 U.S.C. 632 note), and section 2009a of title 39, United States Code, the report accompanying this concurrent resolution on the budget, the joint explanatory statement accompanying the conference report on any concurrent resolution on the budget, shall include in an allocation under section 302(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 to the Committee on Appropriations of the applicable House of Congress amounts for the discretionary administrative expenses of the Social Security Administration and the United States Postal Service.

(b) SPECIAL RULE.—In the Senate and the House of Representatives, for purposes of enforcing section 302(f) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 633(f)), estimates of the level of total new budget authority and total outlays provided by a measure shall include any discretionary amounts described in subsection (a).

#### SEC. 3002. APPLICATION AND EFFECT OF CHANGES IN ALLOCATIONS AND AGGREGATES.

(a) APPLICATION.—Any adjustments of allocations and aggregates made pursuant to this concurrent resolution shall—

(1) apply while that measure is under consideration;

(2) take effect upon the enactment of that measure; and

(3) be published in the Congressional Record as soon as practicable.



(b) EFFECT OF CHANGED ALLOCATIONS AND AGGREGATES.—Revised allocations and aggregates resulting from these adjustments shall be considered for the purposes of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 621 et seq.) as the allocations and aggregates contained in this concurrent resolution.

(c) BUDGET COMMITTEE DETERMINATIONS.—For purposes of this concurrent resolution, the levels of new budget authority, outlays, direct spending, new entitlement authority, revenues, deficits, and surpluses for a fiscal year or period of fiscal years shall be determined on the basis of estimates made by the Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the applicable House of Congress.

#### SEC. 3003. EXERCISE OF RULEMAKING POWERS.

Congress adopts the provisions of this title—

(1) as an exercise of the rulemaking power of the Senate and the House of Representatives, respectively, and as such they shall be considered as part of the rules of each House or of that House to which they specifically apply, and such rules shall supersede other rules only to the extent that they are inconsistent with such other rules; and

(2) with full recognition of the constitutional right of either the Senate or the House of Representatives to change those rules (insofar as they relate to that House) at any time, in the same manner, and to the same extent as is the case of any other rule of the Senate or House of Representatives.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 48, the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. YARMUTH) and a Member opposed each will control 10 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Chairman, the Republican rush to eliminate the Affordable Care Act, to take health insurance from 30 million Americans, introduce chaos into the health insurance market, and give millionaires and billionaires a giant tax cut is misguided and does not reflect the values of the American people. On top of that, it can significantly damage our economy.

Repeal will upend our Nation's healthcare system. Hospitals will see a spike in uncompensated care, leading to reduced services, job cuts, or higher prices for every one. It will cost the Nation 2.6 million jobs in 2019 alone, including 44,000 jobs in Kentucky. The hit to the economy will be in the trillions of dollars, and it will give corporations and the wealthy hundreds of billions of dollars of tax cuts.

Repeal isn't about what is best for the American people. It is solely about politics and what is in the financial interest of the well-off and the well-connected. There is absolutely no logic to this.

That said, if Republicans are determined to rush something through Congress right now using the budget process, we would suggest a totally different approach. Let's look at areas where this Congress and this incoming administration can work together to address a pressing challenge facing the country.

Members of both parties and the President-elect have expressed support for repairing our Nation's failing infrastructure, investing in our roads, bridges, ports, and other transpor-

tation needs to create jobs and build a stronger economic future. The substitute I have offered today provides the budget procedures needed for such a bill to be considered.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to support this alternative budget so we can move our Nation forward together.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition.

The CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Tennessee is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Chairman, the Democratic substitute would guarantee that the American people continue to be harmed by ObamaCare. It would ensure that insurance markets continue to collapse and that premiums and deductibles continue to rise and that patients have less access to healthcare choices.

At a time when we are trying to provide relief to the American people and protect them from a failed and broken status quo, this amendment ignores those who are suffering under the law. It ignores the 20 million Americans who have either paid the ObamaCare penalty or sought an exemption from it because the cost of complying with the law is either too costly or not worth their trouble.

This amendment tells those families who have seen their premiums go up dramatically—many, who are paying more and getting less—that there is no relief in sight for you. What is more, the substitute does not include any reconciliation instructions, and it lacks the savings we achieve through our instructions.

The bottom line is this: ObamaCare is collapsing. It is failing. The American people need relief. And in order to get them that relief, we need to reject this amendment and get to work on patient-centered solutions for our Nation's healthcare challenges.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ), a distinguished member of the Budget Committee.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Chair, as a mother, a breast cancer survivor, and a proud Floridian, I rise today in strong opposition to the majority's irresponsible efforts to repeal the Affordable Care Act. The facts speak for themselves:

20 million Americans, including more than a million and a half Floridians, have obtained quality, affordable health care since the ACA became law.

129 million Americans, who, like me, have preexisting conditions, can no longer be discriminated against by their health insurance company.

Our Nation's young adults now rest easy that they can stay on their parents' insurance until they are 26.

Allow me to remind my colleagues on the other side of the aisle that we are elected to help Americans, not hurt Americans. Make no mistake, repealing the ACA will not only rip health

care away from millions of Americans who have ObamaCare, but we owe it to the 155 million Americans with employer-based coverage to maintain the prohibition against annual and lifetime limits.

Before the ACA, 105 million Americans, most of them with employer coverage, had a lifetime limit on their insurance policy. The ACA prohibits annual and lifetime limits on policies.

We owe it to our seniors to stop the repeal of key new Medicare benefits. Repeal of these lifesaving provisions would actually increase prescription drug costs for millions of seniors in the doughnut hole who are currently saving more than \$2,000 on their drugs due to the ACA by reopening the gap in Medicare part D coverage.

In addition, since enactment of the ACA, the solvency of the Medicare trust fund has been extended by 11 years. And we owe it to the 129 million Americans like me with preexisting conditions, such as breast cancer survivors, to stop repeal so they cannot be dropped or denied coverage or charged an exorbitant premium by their insurance company.

As a cancer survivor, I am also appalled that the Republican plan—or lack of a plan—would increase out-of-pocket costs for every patient by requiring them once again to pay for preventative services like cancer screenings.

Mr. Chairman, the assault on the well-being of our constituents is an outrage, and we will not take it lying down. We will fight tooth and nail for the established right of all Americans to have quality, affordable healthcare coverage and not return to the days when it was available only as a privilege to those who could afford it or who were fortunate enough not to have a preexisting condition.

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. COHEN), a distinguished member of the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Chairman, I have been listening to the debate, and I see the buzzwords that have been used about the repeal of the Affordable Care Act: “patient-centered”—that sounds good—and “against bureaucrats”—that sounds good. What they don't tell you is that it is for the insurance companies.

They say it leaves it patient-centered and for the people to deal with it, not the government—because the people will have to deal with the insurance companies in the future. The people don't want to have to deal with insurance companies when their claims are denied, when they won't pay them, when they won't allow them to have certain procedures. That is what the American people are against.

The Affordable Care Act was insurance reform on steroids. And you can't have all of the insurance reform on steroids without government action looking out for the people versus the insurance companies.

They also don't tell you about rich people, who the other side is always concerned about, who could use tax credits and get a lot more money for their tax credits because they are at a higher tax rate than others. So, in essence, they are going to get more out of this.

What we ought to be doing—it is what this alternative budget is about—is trying to create jobs, jobs for people in infrastructure, construction jobs for people out there in middle America.

America used to be first in infrastructure, and now we are 28th in infrastructure. We need to have an infrastructure that gets goods to market and goods to the public for sale. That helps create jobs further. Jobs is what is important, and it is where America used to be first—in infrastructure jobs.

America has always been last in health care. We were the only industrialized country in the world without a national healthcare policy, and the Republicans never wanted a national healthcare policy until now.

So the Affordable Care Act did good because it woke the people up on the other side of the aisle to the fact that we needed to have a policy to make sure people got health care because they have never, ever cared about it.

Teddy Roosevelt cared about it in their party. Richard Nixon cared about it in their party. Mitt Romney cared about it in their party. But they were mute. They didn't say a word about it. All of a sudden—because they found something they thought is good.

Two-thirds of the people in Tennessee like the Affordable Care Act. Don't repeal it.

Pass this alternative budget and create jobs.

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE), a new member of the Budget Committee.

Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, it is interesting that after 6 years of the mantra of repeal and replace, here we are. And we have repeal and maybe replace at some point when we get around to it; although, that shouldn't be very surprising, considering.

What is ObamaCare?

More than 20 years ago, Senator Bob Dole, then the Republican leader of the Senate, and a group of his colleagues introduced the Republican alternative to the then-Democratic plan to expand health insurance to some 40 million Americans who didn't have it. The Republican plan hatched at the Heritage Foundation was, instead of expanding Medicare for all, let's instead create a system of taxes and tax credits where we pool all the uninsured together and we enable them to buy private health insurance on a marketplace.

Fast-forward about two decades. Barack Obama comes to the White House wanting to compromise, wanting to create a system that would disrupt the existing healthcare system as little as possible, and decides to go in this di-

rection. Then suddenly, all of those on the other side who supported that idea for two decades decided it was socialism and could not possibly be the healthcare law.

So the reason why they don't have an alternative to ObamaCare is because this is the market solution. This was the more moderate approach. This actually isn't a Big Government-run plan.

So I am extending a hand to the other side. If they really want to come up with a way to improve the Affordable Care Act, there are many of us on this side who genuinely want to work on that. I have already voted, as a Member only here 2 years, on ways we can improve the Affordable Care Act and make some modifications, the same way we have made modifications to Medicare and Medicaid many times since 1965.

Mr. Chairman, if the real intent of the other side is just to strip away health insurance to 22 million Americans, we will say "no" and continue to fight it.

□ 1345

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Chairman, as I said in my closing to the debate on the resolution itself, it would be wonderful if the Republicans had a plan that they could describe to the American people so that American families would know what would be in their healthcare future. It would also be nice if they would wait to repeal the Affordable Care Act until they could do that. I think the American people expect it. The poll I mentioned from Kaiser, 82 percent of the people preferred to go in that direction. Let's find out if there is a better way.

I have said many times in public the reason there has been no Republican alternative to the Affordable Care Act is because there really are only two alternatives: one is to go back to the era in which insurance companies decided who lived and died, and the other one is to go to single payer, something like Medicare for everyone. I would love to discuss that option. I think it would be immensely popular in this country. But, instead, Republicans come up with ideas that are drifting in the other direction, again, back to not patient-centered care but back to insurance company-centered care.

The important thing today is that we have an alternative here through which we can actually do something constructive for the American people, something that will help the economy, something that will make vital investments in our Nation and the future economy instead of putting the country's healthcare system at risk. That is what this amendment does. That is why I introduced it, and that is why I urge my colleagues to support it.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. YARMUTH).

The question was taken; and the Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kentucky will be postponed.

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. WOMACK) having assumed the chair, Mr. HULTGREN, Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 3) setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2017 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2018 through 2026, had come to no resolution thereon.

#### PROVIDING FOR EXCEPTION TO LIMITATION AGAINST APPOINTMENT OF PERSONS AS SECRETARY OF DEFENSE WITHIN SEVEN YEARS OF RELIEF FROM ACTIVE DUTY

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 48, I call up the bill (S. 84) to provide for an exception to a limitation against appointment of persons as Secretary of Defense within seven years of relief from active duty as a regular commissioned officer of the Armed Forces and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 48, the bill is considered read.

The text of the bill is as follows:

S. 84

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

#### SECTION 1. EXCEPTION TO LIMITATION AGAINST APPOINTMENT OF PERSONS AS SECRETARY OF DEFENSE WITHIN SEVEN YEARS OF RELIEF FROM ACTIVE DUTY AS REGULAR COMMISSIONED OFFICERS OF THE ARMED FORCES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding the second sentence of section 113(a) of title 10, United States Code, the first person appointed, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, as Secretary of Defense after the date of the enactment of this Act may be a person who is, on the date of appointment, within seven years after relief, but not within three years after relief, from active duty as a commissioned officer of a regular component of the Armed Forces.

(b) LIMITED EXCEPTION.—This section applies only to the first person appointed as Secretary of Defense as described in subsection (a) after the date of the enactment of this Act, and to no other person.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The bill shall be debatable for 90 minutes, equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Armed Services.

The gentleman from Texas (Mr. THORNBERRY) and the gentleman from Washington (Mr. SMITH) each will control 45 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and insert extraneous material on S. 84.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, let me get right to the heart of the matter. We have to pass this legislation in order for James N. Mattis to be able to serve as Secretary of Defense. I know of no one more respected and more admired in the field of national security today than General Mattis. It is true that this is an extraordinary thing we are doing to pass a new law to provide a onetime exception to an underlying law so that a particular individual can serve. The last time we did this was 67 years ago.

Our predecessors then faced challenging times and believed it was appropriate to go through extraordinary lengths to allow an exceptional individual, George C. Marshall, to serve as Secretary of Defense. History reveals that it was fortuitous that they chose to do so.

We face challenging times today. We live in an increasingly dangerous world, and we confront it with a military that has been significantly damaged by budget cuts and other actions. I believe it is appropriate—in fact, I believe it is necessary—for us to rise to meet the challenges of our time as our predecessors did in theirs and allow an exceptional leader to once again serve our country.

Now, there are legitimate complaints about the wording of the resolution, about various procedural flaws, and about not exempting General Mattis from the UCMJ. In that regard, let me correct something I said before the Rules Committee last night. A retired officer can be held accountable for acts after they retire, although never has that happened to someone in civilian office. But there are legitimate complaints about the President-elect's transition team refusing to allow General Mattis to come to a hearing and testify before the House even though he was very eager to do so himself.

I share all of those concerns. I think it was a mistake and shortsighted to deny the House the opportunity to question General Mattis on the issues related to this legislative exception. I think it was an opportunity to facilitate giving him a large, bipartisan vote out of this House which reflects the overwhelming bipartisan support that he has in this House.

But getting back to the bottom line, even with those concerns, we have a responsibility to the men and women who serve, and I think we have a responsibility for the safety and security of every American to see that there is a fully functional Secretary of Defense on day one of the new administration. The only way we can do that is to pass this legislation today.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, first of all, I want to thank the chairman, and I want to thank the members of the Armed Services Committee. I think we had a very excellent debate on this issue yesterday in committee. A lot of very well thought-out opinions on both sides were expressed in a respectful way.

I also want to thank the chairman because the second that it was said that General Mattis was going to be the President-elect's selection for Secretary of Defense, he joined me in saying that we wanted General Mattis to appear before our committee to answer our questions. This is something that has only happened twice, and the first time in 67 years; and our committee members wanted the opportunity to do our job as the House Armed Services Committee and hear from the nominee about how he felt about the civilian control of the military, which is the reason that this law was put in place back in 1947. So I thank the chairman for that. Unfortunately, it didn't happen.

The one thing I would correct, we do have to pass this piece of legislation in order for General Mattis to become the Secretary of Defense. We do not have to do it now. I will explain more on how we can do that in just a second. But the problem of where we are at right now because of the actions of the transition team, we basically, certainly on the House Armed Services Committee and, to some extent, in the full House, are being treated as irrelevant.

It was mentioned during our committee that General Mattis received an 81-17 vote on this legislation in the Senate. That is true, it was bipartisan. He appeared before the Senate Armed Services Committee. The Senate Armed Services Committee was given the respect to do their job, and they heard him, and they asked him questions. It didn't take very long. He was done by 12:30, and they voted. That didn't happen for us.

Really, it is sort of a two-step process in which the legislative branch—in this case, the House—was basically ignored and treated as irrelevant. First was in the continuing resolution that we passed to keep the government open where, with guidance from the transition team, they insisted on very specific language in the CR to set it up so that General Mattis could be confirmed, and that was stuck into the

CR. Now, we, on the Democratic side objected to a couple of things in that at the time, but those objections were ignored, and it was put in, and we were not prepared to shut down the government over this issue since it was put into the CR.

The chairman has mentioned one of the problems with it, and the biggest one, and that is in the past, in the case of General Marshall, they exempted him from this provision that retired officers are subject to the UCMJ. They did not exempt General Mattis. When we are talking about civilian control of the military, if you have a retired military officer who is still subject to military law, that, without question, blurs the line between his being a military officer and his being a civilian. It is something we easily could have fixed. But the way they wrote it into the CR there was no way for us to do that.

Then, second, and more—I can't think of the right word—second and worse, let's just put it that way, as we said, we agreed. We were going to have General Mattis come and talk to us. Both the chairman and I spoke to General Mattis on the phone. He was very anxious to come testify. In fact, 3 days ago, we noticed in our committee that we were going to have a public hearing with General Mattis before us answering our questions and addressing whatever concerns we might have. Then, the next day, 24 hours before he was supposed to appear, the transition team—and as I was led to believe, it was some low-level person on the transition team—said: Nah, we are not going to let him come.

Reporters have asked me many times: Why did the transition team do that? The best answer to that question is because they could, because they just really didn't feel like it. Some people have said: Well, it would be a lot of effort, a lot of work.

Like I said, General Mattis testified before the Senate committee. Most of us watched it on television. He was done at 12:30. We were scheduled to have him at 2:30. He could have had a nice lunch, walked over to the House, sat down for an hour, and the House Armed Services Committee could have been permitted to do its job.

The reason this is important—and I have heard for 8 years endless complaints from the Republican side of the aisle about how President Obama has ignored the legislative branch, how executive authority is making irrelevant the people's House, and how wrong that was. On a number of occasions I've actually agreed with them. I think that has happened.

But here we are before this President is even in office, at the very first opportunity, he is choosing to completely ignore us for no reason. You cannot tell me that General Mattis couldn't handle an hour-and-a-half's worth of questioning in the House Armed Services Committee. He has done it before countless times.

So what we can do and what I think we should do, what I think we should

have done at the time when the transition team called up and said that, is we should have said: Okay. We appreciate your opinion, but you need us to pass this law in order for General Mattis to be Secretary of Defense. We have been told that he is going to appear before our committee. We have told our members of the committee and everybody else that he is going to appear; and until he does, we are not going to pass that law.

Now, I am of the opinion that if we had said that, if we had shown some backbone and stood up for what is our right as the legislative body, that all of a sudden General Mattis would have been available and we could have avoided all of this.

Even today, I submit that if we defeat this bill on the floor, we couldn't get him in by January 20. I grant you that. But we are back January 23 and 24. We were scheduled to be here January 25. I gather that got canceled because the Republican retreat is going to be a bit longer than expected.

□ 1400

But we could certainly take that day back. We could wait 3 or 4 days, which I don't think would be the end of the world, and assert our authority as the legislative branch. Because, let me tell you something, if we set this precedent now, if you think President Obama exercised executive authority in a high-handed way, ignoring the legislative branch, there is every indication that President-elect Trump is going to have an even greater approach in that direction. So if we don't stand up for ourselves now, we are going to be rolled over countless.

We all want to support General Mattis. We want that bipartisan vote. The way to get that bipartisan vote is to do what we said we were going to do, have him come before the Armed Services Committee and simply address the issue we want to raise. That is why I would ask this body to reject this motion now, so that we can actually have the Armed Services Committee do its job.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. WILSON).

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I thank Chairman MAC THORNBERRY for yielding. I appreciate the gentleman's positive leadership as chairman of the House Armed Services Committee.

I am grateful to endorse this selection of General Jim Mattis for Secretary of Defense and, based on his extraordinary background, believe a waiver is appropriate. General Mattis' recent experience in the Middle East makes him uniquely qualified to address the threats to servicemembers overseas and American families at home. I am confident that, through his position, General Mattis will continue the great traditions of civilian control

of the military, delivering peace through strength.

My personal perspective of appreciation of General Mattis is as the grateful son of a World War II Flying Tiger who served in India and China, as the son-in-law of a Marine who received the Navy Cross for Okinawa service, as a 31-year veteran myself of the Army Reserve and Army National Guard, with four sons who have served in the military, as Army Field Artillery in Iraq, as a Navy doctor in Iraq and Italy, as a signal officer in Egypt, as an engineer in Afghanistan, and with an Air Force nephew serving in Iraq.

In his testimony before the Senate yesterday reaffirming the European Reassurance Initiative from the Baltics to Bulgaria, General Mattis spoke bluntly about the readiness crisis facing our military, and we are eager to work with him on the critical task of rebuilding our national defense to promote peace through strength.

Simultaneously, bipartisan endorsements, to me personally, from his fellow Marines confirm he is the right person at the right time.

General Mattis' swift confirmation is crucial to continuity for our ongoing military operations and protecting American families. I urge my colleagues to support the waiver for General Mattis.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MCEACHIN).

Mr. MCEACHIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to this bill.

Mr. Speaker, every one of us in this body was elected to serve and represent the people of our districts. Doing our jobs means fairly and fully considering the legislation that comes before us. If we pass this measure, we will have failed to meet that incredible responsibility.

Our democracy depends, in part, on civilian control of the military. If we are going to appoint a recently retired general as the new Secretary of Defense, that decision calls for careful deliberation and informed debate.

Mr. Speaker, I hear nothing but good things about General Mattis, but the good people of the Fourth Congressional District of Virginia didn't hire me to take someone else's word for it. If we are going to waive this law that has been on the books for oh so many years, Members of this body deserve the opportunity to ask General Mattis questions, to hear his answers, and to weigh his views.

Unlike our colleagues in the Senate, Members of this body did not have the opportunity to have a full committee hearing with General Mattis. For that reason, I urge my colleagues to oppose this bill.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TURNER).

Mr. TURNER. Mr. Speaker, the United States and our allies currently face some of the most complex security challenges in our recent history. ISIS

continues to sweep across much of the Middle East. An expansionist China continues to develop its military prowess in order to counter the United States and its allies in the region. We continue to face a nuclear threat posed by countries such as North Korea and Iran; and an increasingly hostile Russia seeks to destabilize much of Europe.

It is imperative that the Department of Defense not lose continuity in leadership, administration, and governance. General Mattis must be confirmed expeditiously. Such a lapse would create vulnerabilities in our national security strategy and would be detrimental to the safety and security of our Armed Forces.

Civilian control of military is undoubtedly crucial to the success and health of our Defense Department. This candidate's military experience alone should not bar him from serving in a civilian role as the Secretary of Defense. It actually enhances the capabilities he brings to the job. This is a unique exception for a candidate whose exemplary leadership and experience would come at a crucial time for our country and for our men and women in uniform.

I understand that many of our colleagues across the aisle are choosing to vote against a waiver for General Mattis, despite the fact that they support General Mattis himself as an eminently qualified nominee for the Secretary of Defense. That is a mistake. To do so is self-defeating.

Under these circumstances, a vote against the process by which General Mattis is nominated is, in fact, a vote against General Mattis himself from becoming our next Secretary of Defense.

I thank Chairman THORNBERRY for his leadership throughout these important deliberations and for his work for obtaining this waiver for General Mattis and for the future of the service of General Mattis to our country.

I urge our colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support S. 84.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. DAVIS).

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I opposed similar legislation in a markup yesterday, and I cannot support it today. My concerns are not with the exceptional qualifications and decades of honorable service of General Mattis, but I am opposed to a process that has made this House irrelevant.

We have an obligation under the law to review this nomination based on General Mattis' military service, a law that codified the principle of civilian control of the military. General Mattis agreed, and was even eager, according to the chairman, to speak before the Armed Services Committee.

The people have the right to know that the Presidential transition team blocked him from appearing. The American people, frankly, don't care

what unelected members of the transition team think and would much rather hear from General Mattis on why we in the House should grant this exception to law.

His testimony would be in all of our best interest. General Mattis could certainly start the new relationship that he has with the House Armed Services Committee, with our committee, through a thoughtful and a productive conversation on the issues.

Today we are casting off our duty and agreeing to be irrelevant. To accept this legislation without making the appropriate changes, without fully participating in this legislative process, under a closed rule, we are doing nothing to safeguard civilian control of our military. In fact, we are accepting poorly drafted language, and we are not performing proper oversight.

Why are we doing that?

Because the President-elect's transition team said so.

My colleagues have said that there is no requirement that General Mattis speak before us, but I want to say to them: Why cede our power to the Senate? Both houses of Congress have a duty here. Why let a nascent administration push us and a distinguished general around?

I will not roll over and allow the transition team to dictate the charge of the people's House. We can fix this, Mr. Speaker, and we should.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. ROGERS).

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of the rule and passage of H.R. 393, to allow retired General James Mattis to become our Nation's 26th Secretary of Defense.

First of all, I would like to say that I believe civilian control over our military is one of the pivotal principles of our Republic. This body must ensure that our military leaders remain accountable to civilian authorities lest we put our hard-won liberties at risk.

That is why, before I decided to vote for this waiver, I had to answer two very important questions. First, does the appointment of James Mattis present any threat at all to the concept of civilian control of our military?

The answer is clearly no. James Mattis has demonstrated his openness as a straight shooter throughout his long career. I am confident he will continue to candidly face the problems in the Department of Defense and be a positive force for change.

It is James Mattis' record of reform-minded openness, his scholarly understanding of history and military matters, and his almost 4-year separation from defense interests, that assures me that this waiver, as a unique measure, poses no risk to civilian control of the military.

The second question, then: Is the appointment of James Mattis worth waiving the 7-year requirement?

The answer is clearly yes. The United States Armed Forces are at a pivotal

moment in their history. After 8 years of neglect under this administration, our military has been brought to its lowest point in the past 4 decades.

James Mattis has the experience, knowledge, and leadership skills to rally the services while they rebuild for the next 4 decades. He will start on day one with a strong grasp of the challenges facing our military and with the ideas to meet those challenges. That is why I support this one-time waiver, which will allow James Mattis to serve as our Nation's 26th Secretary of Defense.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Nevada (Ms. ROSEN).

Ms. ROSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this legislation.

In the aftermath of World War II, leaders from both parties, who many in this House revere to this day, developed the principle of civilian control of our Armed Forces and codified it into law. They had seen the rise of fascism and communism, and held this principle dear because they believed it was necessary for the safety of our democracy. It was the outgrowth of a long tradition of thinking about civil-military relations, as old as our Republic itself, going back to the Founders.

Yet, almost all of these same leaders and legislators made an exception for General George Marshall; but when they did so, they did not take the action lightly. The exception in 1950 did a number of things that this legislation does not, which my colleagues have spoken about. All are serious, but I want to highlight one.

The exception in 1950 named General Marshall by name and applied the exception only to him. This bill does not name General Mattis, and it is written more broadly. The principle of civilian control of the Armed Forces was important to the Greatest Generation and it was an exception in every sense, an exception for an exceptional individual.

This matter should not be rammed through Congress. There are serious issues to discuss. I believe civil-military relations remain vitally important to the American people and to the health of our democracy.

I believe that General Mattis is an excellent general officer. He has served our Nation well, and he will be a capable Secretary of Defense. My opposition to this legislation is not about General Mattis' capacity to serve in this role.

Mr. Speaker, I ask: Why is this legislation written so that it could apply to other individuals and does not name General Mattis and state that this is only for him?

We are being asked to rush, without conducting proper oversight, without holding a hearing, and after being prevented by an unelected transition team to hear from General Mattis himself.

This is the people's House. The House should have a proper hearing before a decision of this magnitude is made.

General Mattis should have been allowed to testify before our committee, as I am told was his desire. If today's legislation addressed these concerns, which could have been achieved, my vote would likely be different today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. I yield the gentlewoman an additional 30 seconds.

Ms. ROSEN. But I cannot, given this process and this language, vote for this legislation today in good conscience.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WITTMAN).

Mr. WITTMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of S. 84, a bill that would allow for General James Mattis to be considered for an appointment as the 26th Secretary of Defense of the United States.

Leading up to this vote, I have heard time and time again from my colleagues that they respect General Mattis' service to our country. I have also heard that they understand him to be an intelligent, capable leader. Some have even gone so far as to say he is a military hero. I don't doubt the sincerity of my colleagues' words. In fact, I echo them.

But for some of my colleagues, this praise for General Mattis is followed by what I believe is a flawed line of thinking. I have heard the argument that this vote we have before us today is not about General Mattis.

My friends, today's vote is clearly about General Mattis. Make no mistake, a "yes" vote today will not permanently change the requirements prohibiting the appointment of anyone inside of 7 years of Active Duty service.

□ 1415

This vote will provide a one-time-only exception for General Mattis, a man of the utmost character.

The original intent of this law was to prevent an Active-Duty servicemember from retiring and then becoming Secretary of Defense within the same Presidential administration. With President-elect Trump raising his right hand in 7 days, it is clear that General Mattis does not violate the law's original intent. The fact that we are here to deliberate this issue only proves that the nomination and appointment process works.

I am encouraged that we are having this debate today. But at the end of the day, we should not deny the best candidate to become the Secretary of Defense.

A vote of "no" is a vote against General James Mattis. I urge my fellow colleagues to join me in voting in favor of an exception for an exceptional American, General James Mattis.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

This is not a vote against General Mattis. I think I made that very, very clear. I think it is very important that

the House have the opportunity to hear from him, as we said we were going to do.

Now, yes, he has appeared before the Senate. But, as all of us on the Armed Services Committee know, after the transition is over and the new Secretary of Defense is in place, one of the first things they do is come up and report the budget to us. The Secretary of Defense and the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staffs will come up. They go to the Senate, too.

Are we just going to say we can watch the television? Why does he need to go to both places? Why would we bother to have him come all the way over to the House and have our members have the opportunity to ask him questions? I don't want to set that precedent.

So, as passionate as the previous speaker was, please understand—and I have expressed this directly to General Mattis—this is not a vote against General Mattis. In fact, I have said: if we have the opportunity to do our job as the House Armed Services Committee, if we simply do not roll over for the transition team, we would be more than happy to support General Mattis in a bipartisan way. We have plenty of time to do this right, instead of doing it in the rushed way that disregards the power and importance of the House Armed Services Committee.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER).

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of S. 84.

Here is what I think this is about. We feel slighted. We in Congress feel slighted that the Trump administration did not deign to have General Mattis come and speak to us, the House, which is not required by any law, not required by any statute. We feel slighted.

I do feel the same way that the ranking member feels, in terms of how the administration is treating the House of Representatives and this body.

But it is times like this where we need to rise above the slights from the future Trump administration. I think there are going to be a few more. I think this future administration does not hold this body in the highest regard. That is going to become evident over the next 4 years.

I think we are going to have to take things like that as a body and do what is best for this Nation. That is why they argue with the process and that the House was slighted by the future President. I understand it. I feel that as well. But it is time for us to say: hey, we need to be above that. This is about the future of our Nation, it is about our men and women who are serving in conflict right now, under fire, and they need General Mattis as their Secretary of Defense.

For those who assert that the Marshall prohibition, which bars, in the ab-

sence of a waiver, a general from becoming Secretary of Defense, a glance at the operational chain of command is in order.

Under the U.S. Constitution and statute, the command of the Armed Forces flows from the President to the Secretary of Defense to the combatant commanders around the world. The idea that a link in the chain of commanding operations—namely, the Secretary of Defense—cannot be a military leader is nonsensical. General Mattis will bring insight to a job that no background in academia or business could ever provide.

Lastly, when I met General Mattis for the very first time, I was going to Iraq from Kuwait. We got ambushed by machine gun. I got shot in the arm. He drops into my Humvee. We pull out of the ambush area.

My convoy gets up to Dewaniya where Jim Mattis is. I had never met him. I had heard of him a little bit. I was a lieutenant in the Marine Corps. I didn't know much about much at that point. There is General Mattis in the operation center.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. HUNTER. He turns to me and he says: Lieutenant HUNTER, good to see you. I said: good to see you, sir. I was already sweating and shaking, speaking to a one-star general officer. For a lieutenant, that could be very trying.

He said: Did you kill him? I said: Kill who, sir? He said: the guys who ambushed you. I said: no, sir. We followed procedure and drove out of the ambush area. He said: next time, son, you need to kill them.

Hearts of every single man and woman in the U.S. Armed Forces will be filled with pride when John Mattis is sworn in as the next Secretary of Defense.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds.

I have an enormous amount of respect for the gentleman from California. I have enjoyed traveling with him to Afghanistan and elsewhere.

I think what he said in the first part of his remarks was, basically, the Trump administration is going to ignore us, and we just need to get used to it. That is not my interpretation of our jobs. I think we were elected as well, particularly on the Armed Services Committee, and, in our elections, we even got more votes than our opponents. That is how we were able to get here.

So I don't think we should simply roll over for the Trump administration because that is the way he is likely to behave.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. COFFMAN).

Mr. COFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of S. 84.

If we look back at the origin of this 1947 law in the aftermath of World War II, it was really written to require, I think at that time, 10 years of separation between anybody who had served in the military and then serving as a Secretary of Defense. I think one of the core reasons for that is the fact of would there, in fact, be a bias between that military officer and their branch of service.

I think when we look at General Mattis and this waiver, that is certainly not the case. He was the combat and commander for Joint Forces Command when it was standing. The purpose of Joint Forces Command was to integrate our military together in terms of jointness. He was very successful at that. So that bias is not going to be there.

In the State of Colorado, he came out about a year ago to speak before the University of Colorado Denver to our veterans' association. I will never forget those young marines and soldiers who had served under him in combat, those junior enlisted, and how they looked up to him in a way I have never seen junior enlisted look up, in my time in the Army and Marine Corps, to a flag officer in the same way.

So I think he is going to be such an extraordinary asset to the national security of this country, and I am proud to rise in support of S. 84.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. KHANNA), a new member of the Armed Services Committee.

Mr. KHANNA. Mr. Speaker, I want to say what an honor it is to be on this Committee with Chairman THORNBERRY and Ranking Member SMITH and their leadership. When I joined, I was told this was one of the only bipartisan committees in the House. While we had a disagreement—and I associate myself with Ranking Member SMITH's remarks—I will say that, to me, the debate seemed civil. It seemed genuine on philosophical and constitutional principles. I am hopeful that, after this debate, we will be able to work in a bipartisan way.

I know General Mattis was out in Silicon Valley. He has tremendous respect in the Valley for dealing with issues of cybersecurity and the future of the military. I think some of those ideas can help our troops. I look forward to working on the Committee to support those initiatives.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Missouri (Mrs. HARTZLER).

Mrs. HARTZLER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today as an advocate for the United States military and the selfless men and women who fill its ranks.

While I fully appreciate the points that my colleagues are making, this is an extraordinary time as we consider this legislation and an extraordinary man about whom we are talking.

In just 1 week, our Nation will have its new President. Precedent tells us



that we should also have the President's Secretary of Defense to step in and assume control of the Department of Defense that day, as well. Our soldiers, sailors, airmen, and marines must have their organization's leader in position. That clear and steady leadership is crucial when lives are on the line.

The state of our military's readiness, under the current administration, also merits mentioning within this discussion. Troop OPTEMPO rates are dangerously high and retention rate is low. Our aircraft are unreliably old and many maintainers are inexperienced and new. Never before have there been such extraordinary challenges to the manning, training, and equipping of our forces with limited resources.

We ask our troops to stand ready to and actively fight against a resurgent Russia, emergent China, unstable North Korea, unpredictable Iran, and widespread violent terrorism. Never before has there been such an extraordinary demand on our men and women in uniform.

These are extraordinary times with extraordinary circumstances. General Mattis is the extraordinary man who will lead the Department of Defense in the direction it so desperately needs.

For this reason, I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on this measure.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. WENSTRUP).

Mr. WENSTRUP. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of providing a waiver permitting the nomination of General James Mattis to the Office of Secretary of Defense.

General Mattis is an exceptional warrior, strategist, and leader. At a time in which the United States faces an increasingly diverse array of threats around the globe, his unique skill set and decades of experience render him worthy of this exceptional legislation.

Civilian control of the military is a foundational underpinning of our system of government, and it is one of General Mattis' nomination strengths, not weaknesses.

Just as every one is a civilian before they join the military, they return to civilian life when they leave it. Since becoming a civilian 3½ years ago, General Mattis has thoughtfully analyzed the civilian-military relationship, co-editing an analysis of the state of civilian-military relations today. This work includes recommendations that aim to, in his words: "Ensure our military are braided tightly to our broader society in a manner that will keep alive our experiment in democracy."

Throughout his distinguished career, General Mattis has demonstrated a mastery of all aspects of American leadership on the global stage. He has a keen grasp of the value of diplomacy and has been a strong supporter of the State Department and its valuable mission.

Throughout his decades of service, he has accumulated a deep understanding of the importance of deterrence and how a well-guarded peace can prevent conflict before it begins. As a seasoned strategic thinker, he has been an incisive critic of current and serious, long-term planning for American national security that hasn't really existed.

General Mattis knows firsthand the reality of combat and the stakes involved in any decision to use military force. The United States needs a Secretary of Defense equipped to use every tool necessary to defend our Nation and defeat our adversaries.

Because of General Mattis' unique capabilities to address the multitude of threats our country faces today, I urge all my colleagues to support this legislation.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I would just point out that, because of the way this law is written, General Mattis actually will not be going back to civilian life after he leaves. He is still subject to the UCMJ and, therefore, is still, in some ways, a military officer while he will be the "civilian head" of the Defense Department.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE. I thank the gentleman specifically for a clarity on the status of General Mattis as the legislation is written.

I think it is important, Mr. Speaker, that all of us who stand make sure the American people know of our greatest respect and honor for General Mattis. His history of service to this Nation, his tactical expertise, and his ability to acknowledge the constitutional underpinnings of which this Nation is based is without question. But we have, as my colleagues have said on the other side of the aisle, a very serious moment in history.

In the public domain is a conspicuous intrusion of Russia and the election of 2016. There is also knowledge of other areas of which they have used the cyber system for cyber warfare.

The talent of military persons is welcome, but that is the strength of this Nation: that we don't yield and bend this little book called the Constitution, which has, as I indicated, its essence being that our Nation is governed by the civilian population under principles of democracy and equality, the recognition of the three branches of government, and the separation of our military and civilian operation.

□ 1430

This waiver is extraordinary. This waiver, I believe, undermines the very sense of the freedom of our military, its ability to counsel as a separate entity, and it undermines, again, the idea that in 1947 our Congress decided to acknowledge and only waived to General Marshall because of the potential concern and catastrophe of the Korean conflict, now Korean war. It has not been done since.

So I would ask my colleagues whether or not we are going to bend—not bend the arc toward justice and recognition of the Constitution, but bend at any moment of convenience. I do not believe that this is a time in history to bend for convenience.

I believe General Mattis would agree, with his very fine record, that civilian control of the government should be superior and raise the question himself, if asked, whether or not this waiver is for this time and for now and whether or not we are in such a moment of history that that waiver needs to be granted. My view is that it does not. My view is that we should, in essence, adhere to the regularness of constitutional premise and also to recognize the well-established separation of civilian and military.

At this time, I want to thank General Mattis for his service, and I would argue that this resolution should receive a "no" vote from our colleagues in the United States House of Representatives.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to S. 84, which provides an exception to a limitation against appointment of persons as Secretary of Defense within seven years of relief from active duty as a regular commissioned officer of the Armed Forces so that the President-Elect can nominate Gen. James Mattis to serve as the next Secretary of Defense.

Gen. Mattis retired from active duty in 2013, which under current law, makes him ineligible for appointment as Secretary of Defense.

Civilian control of the military has been a bedrock principle of our democracy since the founding of the Republic.

That principle has served the nation well and there is no reason to depart from 66 years of precedent in strictly protecting the American principle of civilian control over the military.

Indeed, in the history of the Department of Defense, the only Defense Secretary ever given a waiver was then-Secretary of State, General George Marshall—who was provided an individual waiver in 1950 at the height of the Korean War in a stand-alone bill approved by the Congress.

It is not the service of the individual nominated or his or her fitness to serve that is in question, but the dangerous precedent that would be set by entrusting leadership of the Department of Defense to a retired military person whose active duty military experiences have not been moderated by the tempering effect of life in the civil sector.

I urge all Members to join me in voting against S. 84.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BYRNE).

Mr. BYRNE. Mr. Speaker, I support this legislation in order to ensure General James Mattis can become the next United States Secretary of Defense. It is critically important to our military men and women as well as to the safety and security of the American people that the Trump administration has a capable, competent Secretary of Defense in place on January 20.

Our soldiers, sailors, and airmen need to know who their leader is, and we

should do everything we can to minimize any gap in leadership. General Mattis is uniquely qualified for this vital role, and his nomination has earned praise from both Democrats and Republicans, as shown by the vote yesterday in the United States Senate.

During his over 40 years of service to our country, he has consistently shown both a great appreciation for the true toils of conflict and the clear ability to defeat an enemy. That is an important balance for anyone leading our military.

Now, I know some of my colleagues on the other side have concerns about the process, but let's not get caught up in a process fight when it comes to the safety and security of the American people. The fundamental question should be: Do you or do you not support General Mattis serving as our Secretary of Defense?

Now, when I found out General Mattis would not be appearing before our committee, of course I was disappointed, but I pulled out my copy of "Meditations" by the great Roman Emperor Marcus Aurelius, which is his favorite book. He carries it with him everywhere. If you read those meditations, you know where they were written. They were written on the northern frontier of the Roman Empire where the Emperor General Marcus Aurelius spent several years to be with his legionnaires as they fought against the enemy across the line of the Rhine. In those meditations he talks about the importance of humility.

Any general who reads the "Meditations" of Marcus Aurelius consistently so that he can remember that his duty is to his soldiers and to a humility before the power that he has is someone who should be leading the Department of Defense of the United States. I have great confidence that he knows that the strength of our military lies in the men and women who fight for us.

I urge my colleagues to support this important legislation to help pave the way for General Mattis to lead our military and protect the safety and the security of the American people.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. RUSSELL).

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Speaker, what is it that objectors are truly afraid of? We hear the words "civilian control of the military" as if somehow those American citizens who have borne the brunt of service or battle are somehow no longer entitled to their citizenship, forever imprinted with some mark of Cain.

What are opponents trying to say? Is it: We are afraid of the warrior class. We are afraid they might cause a war? American battle-hardened warriors understand the need to prevent human suffering, the chaos of destroyed communities, the loss of order, the lack of public services, and carnage caused by

weapons, disease, or hopelessness. My own observation is that the greatest saber rattling often seems to occur from bloviating politicians who have never borne the sword.

What are opponents trying to say? Is it: We are afraid they might take over the government? Well, if there was ever an opportunity for that concern, it was in the 1790s. President George Washington, a general, was revered. He had appointed to his Cabinet five generals and a couple of colonels. If there was ever a time for a military takeover of the United States, it was then. Instead, George Washington relinquished the most important, powerful position in the land. He, like all warriors, understood what it meant to serve their country.

If you look at our own Secretaries of State, historically, nearly one-third had military service, with 10 obtaining senior rank. The parade of notable senior warriors serving as Secretary of State remind us that military leaders have often made the best foreign policy for our country. Why no such concerns about military takeover there? On observation, it appears as if America has a phobia of civilian control of diplomacy.

General Mattis is a warrior who will put the national security and peace of the United States above all other concerns. He will do it with humility and continued selfless service. He needs to be waived and confirmed immediately for the good of our country.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. KELLY).

Mr. KELLY of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the legislation that would allow General James Mattis to be allowed to serve as our Secretary of Defense.

As Members of Congress, we are sworn to uphold the Constitution and defend our country against its enemies. In order to secure our national security, we must have a seamless transition from one administration to another when it comes to military leadership. I somehow wonder which other Cabinet appointees has the House questioned, and the answer is none.

Although this requires a waiver, there is a Senate confirmation process that determines whether or not General James Mattis is the right person. I wish he would have testified in front of our committee, but there is no requirement that he testify in front of our committee. That is why we have the Senate. It is their duty to vet the candidates for these positions. It is their duty to confirm the candidates for each of the Cabinet positions, and no other member who is trying to be on the Cabinet has to come before the House and testify. I do wish General Mattis did because he would have excelled like he has done in every other thing he has done in his life.

I have concerns about the legislation undermining civilian control, also; but I also, like Colonel Russell, think that there may not necessarily be the need for that. Even if there is, there is civilian control of the military. The President is Commander in Chief. The Secretary of Defense answers to the Commander in Chief, who is a civilian.

Some people say interservice rivalry may be the reason that they want him to stay out for 7 years. I can assure you that 30 years from today General Mattis will be as much a marine as he is today, and 7 years or 4 years or 10 years or 30 years will not prevent him from being a marine every day for the rest of his life as he was the days preceding it.

Passing this legislation ensures that our military will have a leader on the day the President is sworn in.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman.

Mr. KELLY of Mississippi. Like the Member who spoke before me—General Grant served as Commander in Chief of the Union armies and later of all the Armies of the U.S. and then was President within 4 years of having that title. General Eisenhower served as Supreme Commander and then served as President of the United States, the ultimate civilian authority. General Washington was also our first President.

I ask that we pass this legislation and that we say yes to General Mattis.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds just to say, not to be a stickler for detail, but we are actually not giving a waiver here. We are changing the law, and that is what makes this appointment different. When you confirm someone to the Cabinet, the gentleman is absolutely right, the Senate, that is their authority. It is in the Constitution. We don't get involved in that. But when you are changing a law, the House has a say in that. It is the Senate and the House.

This debate actually makes me even more strongly opposed to this bill as I continue to hear about: We just don't matter. The Senate has got it. Trump has got it. What do we need to do?

We have a responsibility as the House, and when you are changing a law, it has to go through the Senate and the House.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. GALLAGHER).

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, like every marine of my generation, during my time in the Corps I gained a profound respect for General Jim Mattis as simply the finest warrior that we have produced since Chesty Puller, and much has been made in the last few weeks about his war-fighting prowess.

What commands my respect, why I rise today, and what I believe binds

Jim so closely to the hearts of everyone who has ever worn the uniform is his humility. General Mattis understands not only how to wield military power decisively but also its limits. General Mattis also realizes that the true source of our military strength doesn't come from the E-ring of the Pentagon but, rather, from the fighting spirit of the brave soldiers, sailors, airmen, and marines that are deployed right now doing a very dangerous job.

As the chairman mentioned, they deserve a Secretary of Defense on day one. With Jim Mattis as that Secretary, they will have a leader who always puts their welfare first and their mission first.

Now, I respect the concerns of my colleagues about the longstanding principle of civilian control of the military, but I know Jim Mattis personally, and I know how seriously he holds this principle as well. When I deployed to Iraq in 2007 and again in 2008, it was the words of General Mattis that reminded us that, if we ever showed contempt for civilians, we would give the enemy a victory.

So I say, for the mission's sake, for our country's sake, and the sake of men and women who have carried our colors in past battles, let's come together today in support of Jim Mattis and thereby send a signal to the world that there is once again no better friend, no worse enemy than the United States of America.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. BACON).

Mr. BACON. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of S. 84 today to do this one-time exception so that we can have General Mattis as our next Secretary of Defense.

Today our Nation is confronted with a complex array of transregional threats. We exist in one of the most dynamic and dangerous periods in our history, and this list of threats grow more vast and more dangerous. In the meantime, our military readiness is at dangerous lows and our modernization falls behind. Amidst these dangers, we are fortunate to be presented with a historic opportunity to select and elevate one of the most distinguished military leaders in our Nation's history to the position of Secretary of Defense.

General Mattis is many things. He is an infantry marine, a decorated warrior, an experienced combat leader, and a respected commander who has fought our Nation's wars and knows firsthand the human costs of war and the consequences of operating unguided by strategy.

James Mattis is also a strategic thinker who understands that true strength and security results from coordinated application of all elements of national power: our diplomatic influence, our economic wealth, our values,

and, only when absolutely necessary, our military force.

Mr. Speaker, not since George Marshall have we had a nominee whose distinguished military service record and mastery of operational art is matched by his intellectual prowess and grasp of strategy. One thing else is clear: not since General George Marshall have we needed this type of leader as our Secretary of Defense.

We need a Secretary of Defense Mattis on day one of the Trump administration. A vote "no" means we won't have him on day one. It could be day 3 or day 30.

Our men and women in uniform deserve General Mattis as their Secretary of Defense on day one. These are extraordinary times, and General Mattis is an extraordinary leader. We need him on day one. I urge support for the one-time exception.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BANKS).

□ 1445

Mr. BANKS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my strong support for granting a waiver for James Mattis continuing his distinguished service to our Nation as our next Secretary of Defense.

We live in deeply troubling times as America's standing in the world and our military readiness have both deteriorated significantly over the past 8 years. Whether it is only one-third of the active Army's brigade combat teams being ready for combat, or Marines being forced to pull spare parts from museum aircraft to repair their F/A-18 Super Hornet fighter jets. These are not the marks of a ready force.

This moment requires trusted leadership and someone with a genuine understanding of what is required of our brave men and women to stand ready when our Nation calls. There is no one better equipped to understand the dangers that we face, how to repair our world image, and set us on a path to rebuilding our military than President-elect Trump's nominee for Secretary of Defense, General James Mattis. General Mattis embodies all of the traits we should look for when selecting a Secretary of Defense.

As a member of the Armed Services Committee, I look forward to working with him to put our military back on sure footing and help advance our Nation toward peace and stability.

I encourage my colleagues to vote "yes" on the measure.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. ROTHFUS).

Mr. ROTHFUS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of this legislation.

Civilian control of the military is a very important principle that has

served our country well. Current law provides that there should be a 7-year gap between military service and serving as the Secretary of Defense. This is a general rule, but we know there are always exceptions to the rule. That is what this legislation makes today, clearing the path for a retired general who has been back in the civilian world for more than 3½ years.

I support this exception because we live in exceptional times. Over the past 15 years, we have seen millions of American servicemembers deployed overseas. Thousands are still deployed. They have served well and served with courage. Many of them, and their families, have paid a particularly heavy price. More than 6,000 did not come home. Tens of thousands sustained life-changing injuries. Thousands have injuries we cannot see. Many families broke under the pressure of repeated deployments.

Retired General James Mattis, now a civilian, has been there. He has been with these soldiers. He has been with these families. I appreciate the perspective General Mattis will bring to the Defense Department and President-elect's national security team. He understands more than most in a very personal way the gravity of putting our servicemembers in harm's way. He understands the moral obligation we have to ensure that those who are sent into harm's way are properly equipped. As important, he will be able to convey to his national security counterparts the impact decisions made in Washington have on the war fighter.

General Mattis is the right person at the right time. I encourage my colleagues to support this waiver and vote for this legislation.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DESANTIS).

Mr. DESANTIS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this measure.

I think it is important to point out that when you talk about civilian control, General Mattis is, in fact, a civilian. He is not in command of any Marine divisions right now. I don't think prior military service should be held against him when he has the ability to offer additional service to the country.

I hear this argument that: Well, he is a retired general, he is subject to the UCMJ. That is not an argument that has much merit. If that were the case, you couldn't have retired military officers serve in the Congress. If they were still considered military officers, it would violate the incompatibility clause of the Constitution.

Now, this 7-year statutory restriction, I think it is understandable, but I don't think it is in any way sacrosanct. If you go back to the founding of our country, a 7-year restriction would have prevented George Washington from being the first civilian commander in chief because he had resigned his commission in 1784, he took

the oath of office as our first President in 1789. Nobody was under any illusions that he was a civilian, and he was somebody who was revered.

Now, it is true the Founders feared the civil being subordinate to the military, but that is because they thought Republican government could be overrun by a military junta. We don't have that danger here. We have a civilian President of the United States, a civilian Congress that is charged under the Constitution with providing and maintaining our Navy, with raising and supporting our armies, and prescribing rules for the regulation of the Armed Forces, and we will have Jim Mattis, who is a civilian, as a Secretary of Defense.

This man, Jim Mattis, has been a faithful servant to our country. He is also a strategic thinker, who I think can do a great job in rebuilding our military and getting our national security policy on a firmer, stronger foundation.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. TAYLOR).

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak in support of General Mattis. I rise to speak to my colleagues, both Republican and Democrat. I rise to appeal to the unity of our Chamber, unity of our voice to the world, unity for our men and women who voluntarily fight on our behalf.

Less than 1 percent of this Nation has gone forth for the past 15 years, over and over, sacrificing their youth, time with their loved ones, and sometimes their lives. Imagine you are standing there next to your spouse, best friend, or battle buddy at attention, and a flag-draped coffin passes you by, carried by an honor guard dressed in impeccable military uniform. Uncontrollable tears flow around the room as a ceremonial flag is tightly folded and presented to the stoic Gold Star family. "Amazing Grace" played on the bagpipes is at once the most beautiful and the most dreadful tone you have ever heard. You yearn to hear it again, and you never want to hear it again.

Men and women like General Mattis, who have been here, understand the true costs of war. Men and women like General Mattis will think deliberately and carefully about putting the military into harm's way. Men and women like General Mattis will fight very hard to put the tools and the leadership in the hands of the military members so that they may win.

Military members, perhaps more than our civilian counterparts, understand civilian control of the Armed Forces. For in every headquarters building that General Mattis or anyone else has served, there is a prominent display of pictures of civilian leadership above military commanders.

I am not naive to the politics. I, too, believe he should have been here yes-

terday, but those opposed have made their point. We were divided yesterday, but we can unify today. I ask that you rise above politics. I ask you to support General Mattis not just with your words, but with your vote. I ask that you show the same unity military members show each other every single day. Let's give them a leader on day one.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I would inform the gentleman that I have no additional requests for time, and I reserve the balance of my time in order to close.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of the time.

I thank the folks for the debate. I think it has been very good, as it was in committee. But it is disturbing to hear this described as politics, or we feel slighted and we should rise above that. This isn't what this is about. It is about our exercising our constitutional authority as Members of the House and our constitutional authority as members of the Armed Services Committee. It is about us being relevant in the process and doing our jobs, as I said in the opening.

Again, there is every opportunity to confirm and then also pass this change in the law that is necessary to make General Mattis the next Secretary of Defense. We can simply insist with the transition team that he appear before our committee. As I have pointed out, if we had done that in the first place, we could have met the January 20 deadline; and even now we could still do it by January 23 or 24. I don't think a few days would make that big a difference compared to the institution of the House actually mattering.

Now, I will say that, as I listened to the debate today, I become even a little bit more disturbed, as we have heard some of the reasoning behind supporting this change in the law to allow General Mattis to become the Secretary of Defense. As was said, basically, the Trump administration is going to do this kind of thing quite frequently, as one Member of the opposite party said, so we should just get used to it.

I really do think that makes it all the more important at this point, at this moment, that we assert our authority. Again, we can do that and have a bipartisan vote and approve General Mattis. We just have to insist upon it instead of rolling over and accepting what the transition team has said. That was my original argument. I will not belabor it or restate it. I think it is compelling. I think we should stand up for our rights here in the House and on the Armed Services Committee.

The final thing I will say is, while I have an enormous amount of respect for General Mattis—and like many who have spoken, I have not served in the armed services, I didn't work with him there, but I certainly have worked with him on the committee—I will point out

that General Mattis is not God. As we listen to the people talk here about how we absolutely have to have somebody from the warrior class lead us in the military, that we have to have him in there in order to protect us from this dangerous world, that sort of language kind of makes me a little nervous.

That is the point of civilian control of the military. We do not want to be run by the warrior class alone. Now, absolutely we have many Members on both sides of the aisle who have served in the military, and I think that is terrific. That perspective is enormously important. It is not the only perspective that is important to running a representative democracy. We have heard comparisons to the Roman Empire. Again, another analogy that is somewhat troubling. That is not what we want. But more than anything, what we don't want is we don't want a president who thinks that he can roll over the House Armed Services Committee and the entire House any time he feels like it, frankly, as in this case, for no reason.

General Mattis, as everyone has admitted, was perfectly prepared to testify, perfectly prepared to come before us, and they simply decided not to send him. I don't think it was mere pettiness or anything like that. I have watched the way President-elect Trump conducts himself, and he is, shall we say, aggressive. I think they wanted to make it clear that they are going to be running things and that we better get the heck out of the way.

Well, that is not what I was elected to do as a member of the House Armed Services Committee or a Member of the House. We are not here simply to get out of the way of President Obama or President-elect Trump. We are here to stand up for the people who elected us and for the country and to do our jobs. In this case, for no good reason, we were denied the ability to do that.

So, again, I will urge Members to vote down this bill today so that we can assert our authority, hear from General Mattis, get him approved, go forward, but do it in a way that shows that the House of Representatives and the House Armed Services Committee actually matter. We cannot set the precedent that the President of the United States can simply ignore us on a whim.

So I would urge us to vote "no" on this matter.

I, again, thank the chairman for his leadership on this. We have worked very closely on this issue, amongst many others. To echo the comments of the freshman colleague from California, this is a very bipartisan committee. It will continue to be. We have done a bill for 55 straight years, and I am hoping we will make it 56 this year. I look forward to working with Chairman THORNBERRY, all of the members of the committee, and all of the Members of the House to achieve that goal.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of the time.

Mr. Speaker, I completely agree that this is a bipartisan committee. Here we have a large amount of agreement, but we have a difference of judgment on what is best for the country.

I would say to all Members: We are about to do our job, and that is vote up or down on legislation that would allow General Mattis to serve.

Now, we are not irrelevant, because if we don't vote for this legislation, he does not serve. That is what Members are elected to do: to vote. We are about to vote, and we have essentially two choices.

Mr. Speaker, as I made clear, I share many of the concerns about the process, about some of the decisions that the transition team made. There has been a lot of discussion about this setting a poor precedent; but, actually, there is only one precedent before us. That was 1950 with General Marshall. And General Marshall himself did not testify in front of the House or the Senate on the waiver legislation.

It was only after the waiver legislation was signed into law that General Marshall came to testify in front of the Senate for his confirmation hearing. But there is nothing that is different from what we are doing today from the only precedent that exists. So the notion that we are suddenly irrelevant, that we are harming the House, et cetera, I believe is mistaken.

I hope that we do not have a national security crisis on January 21 or 22, but the fact is, unless we pass this bill today, we are not able to have a Secretary of Defense on January 20. I think, given the state of the world and given a number of other factors, it is important that we do so.

□ 1500

Just two other brief points, Mr. Speaker.

The press is reporting that the White House has indicated that President Obama will sign this legislation. I hope he does. That would ensure that General Mattis, if confirmed by the Senate on January 20, will go ahead and be sworn in and take office at that point.

There are, as I have said, many concerns about how this was handled—the wording, et cetera. The bottom line, as some of my colleagues have mentioned, is that there are men and women who have volunteered to serve our Nation even at the risk of their own lives. There are Americans throughout the country who depend on those men and women to keep them safe and secure. All of them deserve to have a Secretary of Defense who is fully functional on day one of the administration. The only way that happens is to vote “yes.” I urge my colleagues to do so.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today on this piece of legislation before us that would provide a waiver for the appointment of Mr. Jim Mattis to serve as Secretary of De-

fense. I've listened to and respect much of the conversation here today from my colleagues on the other side of the aisle. However, much of it is repetitive from a process standpoint. Nothing I've heard so far says that the commander in chief will not be president of the United States, so the ultimate civilian leadership rests with the commander and chief. He then hires someone with the advice and consent of the Senate to be the Secretary of Defense. I don't know what's magic about the requirement to wait for seven years. I've heard nothing during this process conversation on the floor today that says anyone needs a seven year detox [detoxification] program to shed themselves of all the nasty vices you get while serving in the military. We've got a general officer sitting on the front row of the Armed Services Committee; we've got a colonel sitting on the second row of the Armed Services Committee to name just a few, and no one would remotely suggest that they are more loyal to the military than they are loyal to the constituents they represent back home. So, I ask, why is five years not an appropriate length of time for a detox program? Why is three years not appropriate? Clearly, no one is going to put a uniformed officer in the position of Secretary of Defense. So as we think about the appropriate amount of time for a nominee to Secretary of Defense to have been out of the military, I've not heard the psychology behind or scientific evidence to say seven years is somehow a magic length of time.

Mr. Mattis has been out of the military for four years and I'm quite comfortable saying that he is going to be more respectful of the civilian as he approaches the job than his previous service as a military man. The conversation and debate has been high-minded and respectful and I appreciate that, but this is going to be a party-line vote. And unfortunately, you are going to send the next Secretary of Defense into his role to lead every man and woman in uniform with a split vote between the majority and minority. That does not send a very good message. I can assure you those young sergeants and E-4s and E-3s out there that are going to be asked to follow the instruction of the civilian leadership will be much more impressed if it was a unanimous vote for Mr. Mattis. So however you couch your language, I'm voting for Mr. Mattis to be Secretary of Defense today. My vote on this bill will be for Mr. Mattis to be Secretary of Defense. The process discussed now by my colleagues, I understand. You can make those arguments and you have done that very well—and I respect that. But, for me and my vote, it will be for Mr. Mattis to be Secretary of Defense.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I am deeply troubled by the majority's action this week in capitulating to the President-elect's transition team to deny the House the opportunity to hear from the esteemed nominee for Secretary of Defense, General James Mattis.

To eliminate the opportunity for the chamber closest to the American citizens, the People's House, to have a full dialogue in advance of changing a law paramount to the civilian control of the Defense Department is troubling. Rolling over a Congressional Chamber to expedite a waiver that has only happened once before denigrates the responsibilities of our representative democracy.

General James Mattis—has served our nation and the U.S. Marine Corps with distinction

in war and peace. He has earned the moniker “warrior-monk-intellectual” for his devotion to his soldiers, the library of widely ranging books he carries with him, and his lifetime devotion to the study of war.

To politicize the nomination of a great General rather than allow Congress the proper procedure to deliberate his talent and experience is a blemish to liberty.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, today, I will vote against S. 84, the bill to exempt retired Marine Gen. James N. Mattis from the prohibition on individuals who have spent less than seven years out of uniform for appointment as Secretary of Defense. Even though he is qualified and probably the best appointee we could expect from the Trump administration, there is a reason for the law that requires a waiver. This issue should have been addressed more directly.

Civilian control of the Armed Forces is a critical cornerstone of our democracy. Regardless of the individual under consideration for such a waiver, a major departure from longstanding law merits a full conversation and discussion in Congress. I am concerned by reports that the Trump presidential transition team prevented Gen. Mattis from testifying before the House Armed Services Committee, though he was willing.

It's unfortunate that both chambers did not have the opportunity to hear from Gen. Mattis. I suspect that if the process were allowed to work, he may well have received stronger bipartisan support for the waiver.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 48, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

#### CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2017

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 48 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the concurrent resolution, S. Con. Res. 3.

Will the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. HOLDING) kindly take the chair.

□ 1501

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the

further consideration of the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 3) setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2017 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2018 through 2026, with Mr. HOLDING (Acting Chair) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The Acting CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole rose earlier today, a request for a recorded vote on amendment No. 1 printed in House Report 115-4 by the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. YARMUTH) had been postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. YARMUTH

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, the unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. YARMUTH) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

#### RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 149, noes 272, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 57]

#### AYES—149

Adams	Evans	Meeks
Barragán	Fudge	Meng
Bass	Gabbard	Moore
Beatty	Gallagher	Moulton
Becerra	Garamendi	Nadler
Beyer	Gonzalez (TX)	Napolitano
Bishop (GA)	Green, Al	Neal
Blumenauer	Grijalva	Nolan
Blunt Rochester	Gutiérrez	Norcross
Bonamici	Hanabusa	O'Rourke
Boyle, Brendan	Hastings	Pallone
F.	Heck	Panetta
Brady (PA)	Higgins (NY)	Pascarella
Brown (MD)	Hoyer	Payne
Butterfield	Huffman	Pelosi
Capuano	Jackson Lee	Perlmutter
Carbajal	Jayapal	Pingree
Cárdenas	Jeffries	Pocan
Carson (IN)	Johnson (GA)	Price (NC)
Cartwright	Johnson, E. B.	Quigley
Castor (FL)	Kaptur	Raskin
Castro (TX)	Keating	Richmond
Chu, Judy	Kelly (IL)	Roybal-Allard
Cicilline	Kennedy	Ruppersberger
Clark (MA)	Khanna	Ryan (OH)
Clarke (NY)	Kihuen	Sánchez
Clay	Kildee	Sarbanes
Cohen	Krishnamoorthi	Schakowsky
Conyers	Langevin	Schiff
Courtney	Larsen (WA)	Scott (VA)
Crowley	Larson (CT)	Scott, David
Cummings	Lawson (FL)	Serrano
Davis (CA)	Lee	Sewell (AL)
Davis, Danny	Levin	Shea-Porter
DeFazio	Lewis (GA)	Sherman
DeGette	Lowenthal	Sires
DeLauro	Lowey	Slaughter
Demings	Lujan Grisham,	Smith (WA)
DeSaulnier	M.	Speier
Deutch	Luján, Ben Ray	Swalwell (CA)
Dingell	Lynch	Takano
Doggett	Maloney,	Thompson (CA)
Doyle, Michael	Carolyn B.	Thompson (MS)
F.	Maloney, Sean	Titus
Ellison	Matsui	Tonko
Engel	McCollum	Torres
Eshoo	McEachin	Vargas
Españillat	McGovern	Veasey
Esty	McNerney	Vela

Velázquez	Waters, Maxine	Yarmuth
Wasserman	Watson Coleman	
Schultz	Welch	

#### NOES—272

Abraham	Gohmert	Palmer
Aderholt	Goodlatte	Paulsen
Aguilar	Gosar	Pearce
Allen	Gotthelmer	Perry
Amash	Gowdy	Peters
Amodei	Granger	Peterson
Arrington	Graves (GA)	Pittenger
Babin	Graves (LA)	Poe (TX)
Bacon	Graves (MO)	Poliquin
Banks (IN)	Griffith	Polis
Barletta	Grothman	Posey
Barr	Guthrie	Ratcliffe
Barton	Harper	Reed
Bera	Harris	Reichert
Bergman	Hartzler	Renacci
Beutler	Hensarling	Rice (NY)
Biggs	Hice, Jody B.	Rice (SC)
Bilirakis	Higgins (LA)	Roby
Bishop (MI)	Hill	Roe (TN)
Bishop (UT)	Himes	Rogers (AL)
Black	Holding	Rogers (KY)
Blackburn	Hollingsworth	Rohrabacher
Blum	Hudson	Rokita
Bost	Huizenga	Rooney, Francis
Brady (TX)	Hultgren	Rooney, Thomas
Brat	Hunter	J.
Bridenstine	Hurd	Ros-Lehtinen
Brooks (AL)	Issa	Rosen
Brooks (IN)	Jenkins (KS)	Roskam
Brownley (CA)	Jenkins (WV)	Ross
Buchanan	Johnson (LA)	Rothfus
Buck	Johnson (OH)	Rouzer
Bucshon	Johnson, Sam	Royce (CA)
Budd	Jones	Ruiz
Burgess	Jordan	Russell
Bustos	Joyce (OH)	Sanford
Byrne	Katko	Scalise
Calvert	Kelly (MS)	Schneider
Carter (GA)	Kelly (PA)	Schrader
Carter (TX)	Kilmer	Schweikert
Chabot	Kind	Scott, Austin
Chaffetz	King (IA)	Sensenbrenner
Cheney	King (NY)	Sessions
Coffman	Kinzinger	Shimkus
Cole	Knight	Shuster
Collins (GA)	Kuster (NH)	Simpson
Collins (NY)	Kustoff (TN)	Sinema
Comer	Labrador	Smith (MO)
Comstock	LaHood	Smith (NE)
Conaway	LaMalfa	Smith (NJ)
Connolly	Lamborn	Smith (TX)
Cook	Lance	Smucker
Cooper	Latta	Soto
Correa	Lewis (MN)	Stefanik
Costa	Lipinski	Stewart
Costello (PA)	LoBiondo	Stivers
Cramer	Loebach	Suozzi
Crawford	Lofgren	Taylor
Crist	Long	Tenney
Cuellar	Loudermilk	Thompson (PA)
Culberson	Love	Thornberry
Curbelo (FL)	Lucas	Tiberi
Davidson	Luetkemeyer	Tipton
Raskin	MacArthur	Trott
Davis, Rodney	Marchant	Tsongas
Delaney	Marino	Turner
DelBene	Marshall	Upton
Denham	Massie	Valadao
Dent	Mast	Visclosky
DeSantis	McCarthy	Wagner
DesJarlais	McCaul	Walberg
Diaz-Balart	McClintock	Walden
Donovan	McHenry	Walker
Duffy	McKinley	Walorski
Duncan (SC)	McMorris	Walters, Mimi
Duncan (TN)	Rodgers	Walz
Dunn	McSally	Weber (TX)
Emmer	Meadows	Webster (FL)
Farenthold	Meehan	Wenstrup
Faso	Messer	Westerman
Ferguson	Mitchell	Williams
Fitzpatrick	Moolenaar	Wilson (SC)
Fleischmann	Mooney (WV)	Wittman
Flores	Mullin	Womack
Fortenberry	Murphy (FL)	Woodall
Foster	Murphy (PA)	Yoder
Fox	Newhouse	Yoho
Franks (AZ)	Noem	Young (AK)
Frelinghuysen	Nunes	Young (IA)
Gaetz	O'Halleran	Zeldin
Gallagher	Olson	
Garrett	Palazzo	
Gibbs		

#### NOT VOTING—13

Cleaver	Lieu, Ted	Rutherford
Clyburn	Mulvaney	Wilson (FL)
Frankel (FL)	Pompeo	Zinke
Green, Gene	Price, Tom (GA)	
Lawrence	Rush	

□ 1524

Messrs. LATTA, CARTER of Georgia, SENSENBRENNER, DAVIDSON, Ms. TSONGAS, Messrs. SOTO, and VISCLOSKEY changed their vote from “aye” to “no.”

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. QUIGLEY, Ms. MOORE and Mr. WELCH changed their vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Ms. WILSON of Florida. Mr. Chair, had I been present, I would have voted “yea” on rollcall No. 57.

The Acting CHAIR. There being no further amendments, under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON) having assumed the chair, Mr. HOLDING, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 3) setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2017 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2018 through 2026, and, pursuant to House Resolution 48, he reported the concurrent resolution back to the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on adoption of the concurrent resolution.

Under clause 10 of rule XX, the yeas and nays are ordered.

Members will record their votes by electronic device.

Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, this 5-minute vote on adoption of the concurrent resolution will be followed by 5-minute votes on passage of the bill, S. 84, and agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal, if ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 227, nays 198, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 58]

#### YEAS—227

Abraham	Bost	Collins (GA)
Aderholt	Brady (TX)	Collins (NY)
Allen	Brat	Comer
Amodei	Bridenstine	Comstock
Arrington	Brooks (AL)	Conaway
Babin	Brooks (IN)	Cook
Bacon	Buchanan	Costello (PA)
Banks (IN)	Buck	Cramer
Barletta	Bucshon	Crawford
Barr	Budd	Culberson
Barton	Burgess	Curbelo (FL)
Bergman	Byrne	Davidson
Beutler	Calvert	Davis, Rodney
Biggs	Carter (GA)	Denham
Bilirakis	Carter (TX)	DeSantis
Bishop (MI)	Chabot	DesJarlais
Bishop (UT)	Chaffetz	Diaz-Balart
Black	Cheney	Donovan
Blackburn	Coffman	Duffy
Blum	Cole	Duncan (SC)



Duncan (TN) LaMalfa  
Dunn Lamborn  
Emmer LANCE  
Farenthold Latta  
Faso Lewis (MN)  
Ferguson LoBiondo  
Fleischmann Long  
Flores Loudermilk  
Fortenberry Love  
Foxy Lucas  
Franks (AZ) Luetkemeyer  
Frelinghuysen Marchant  
Gaetz Marino  
Gallagher Marshall  
Garrett Mast  
Gibbs McCarthy  
Gohmert McCaul  
Goodlatte McHenry  
Gosar McKinley  
Gowdy McMorris  
Granger Rodgers  
Graves (GA) McSally  
Graves (LA) Meadows  
Graves (MO) Meehan  
Griffith Messer  
Grothman Mitchell  
Guthrie Moolenaar  
Harper Mooney (WV)  
Harris Mullin  
Hartzler Murphy (PA)  
Hensarling Newhouse  
Hice, Jody B. Noem  
Higgins (LA) Nunes  
Hill Olson  
Holding Palazzo  
Hollingsworth Palmer  
Hudson Paulsen  
Huizenga Pearce  
Hultgren Perry  
Hunter Pittenger  
Hurd Poe (TX)  
Issa Poliquin  
Jenkins (KS) Posey  
Jenkins (WV) Ratcliffe  
Johnson (LA) Reed  
Johnson (OH) Reichert  
Johnson, Sam Renacci  
Jordan Rice (SC)  
Joyce (OH) Roby  
Kelly (MS) Roe (TN)  
Kelly (PA) Rogers (AL)  
King (IA) Rogers (KY)  
King (NY) Rohrabacher  
Kinzinger Rokita  
Knight Rooney, Francis  
Kustoff (TN) Rooney, Thomas  
LaHood J.

## NAYS—198

Adams Crowley  
Aguilar Cuellar  
Amash Cummings  
Barragán Davis (CA)  
Bass Davis, Danny  
Beatty DeFazio  
Becerra DeGette  
Bera Delaney  
Beyer DeLauro  
Bishop (GA) DelBene  
Blumenauer Demings  
Blunt Rochester Dent  
Bonamici DeSaulnier  
Boyle, Brendan Deutch  
F. Dingell  
Brady (PA) Doggett  
Brown (MD) Doyle, Michael  
Brownley (CA) F.  
Bustos Ellison  
Butterfield Engel  
Capuano Eshoo  
Carbajal Espallat  
Cárdenas Esty  
Carson (IN) Evans  
Cartwright Fitzpatrick  
Castor (FL) Foster  
Castro (TX) Fudge  
Chu, Judy Gabbard  
Cicilline Gallego  
Clark (MA) Garamendi  
Clarke (NY) Gonzalez (TX)  
Clay Gottheimer  
Cohen Green, Al  
Connolly Grijalva  
Conyers Gutiérrez  
Cooper Hanabusa  
Correa Hastings  
Costa Heck  
Courtney Higgins (NY)  
Crist Himes

Ros-Lehtinen  
Roskam  
Ross  
Rothfus  
Rouzer  
Royce (CA)  
Russell  
Ryan (WI)  
Sanford  
Scalise  
Schweikert  
Scott, Austin  
Sensenbrenner  
Sessions  
Shimkus  
Shuster  
Simpson  
Smith (MO)  
Smith (NE)  
Smith (NJ)  
Smith (TX)  
Smucker  
Stefanik  
Stewart  
Stivers  
Taylor  
Tenney  
Thompson (PA)  
Thornberry  
Tiberi  
Tipton  
Trott  
Turner  
Upton  
Valadao  
Wagner  
Walberg  
Walden  
Walker  
Walorski  
Walters, Mimi  
Weber (TX)  
Webster (FL)  
Wenstrup  
Westerman  
Williams  
Wilson (SC)  
Wittman  
Womack  
Woodall  
Yoder  
Yoho  
Young (AK)  
Young (IA)  
Zeldin

Hoyer  
Huffman  
Jackson Lee  
Jayapal  
Jeffries  
Johnson (GA)  
Johnson, E. B.  
Jones  
Kaptur  
Katko  
Keating  
Kelly (IL)  
Kennedy  
Khanna  
Kihuen  
Kildee  
Kilmer  
Kind  
Krishnamoorthi  
Kuster (NH)  
Labrador  
Langevin  
Larsen (WA)  
Larson (CT)  
Lawrence  
Lawson (FL)  
Lee  
Levin  
Lewis (GA)  
Lieu, Ted  
Lipinski  
Loeb sack  
Lofgren  
Lowenthal  
Lowe  
Lujan Grisham,  
M.  
Luján, Ben Ray  
Lynch  
MacArthur

Maloney,  
Carolyn B.  
Maloney, Sean  
Massie  
Matsui  
McClintock  
McCollum  
McEachin  
McGovern  
McNerney  
Meeks  
Meng  
Moore  
Moulton  
Murphy (FL)  
Nadler  
Napolitano  
Neal  
Nolan  
Norcross  
O'Halleran  
O'Rourke  
Pallone  
Panetta  
Pascarell  
Payne  
Pelosi  
Perlmutter

Cleaver  
Clyburn  
Frankel (FL)  
Green, Gene

Peters  
Peterson  
Pingree  
Pocan  
Polis  
Price (NC)  
Quigley  
Raskin  
Rice (NY)  
Richmond  
Rosen  
Roybal-Allard  
Ruiz  
Ruppersberger  
Ryan (OH)  
Sanchez  
Sarbanes  
Schakowsky  
Schiff  
Schneider  
Schrader  
Scott (VA)  
Scott, David  
Serrano  
Sewell (AL)  
Shea-Porter  
Sherman  
Sinema

## NOT VOTING—10

Mulvaney  
Pompeo  
Price, Tom (GA)  
Rush  
Rutherford  
Zinke

## ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1531

So the concurrent resolution was concurred in.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

# PROVIDING FOR EXCEPTION TO LIMITATION AGAINST APPOINTMENT OF PERSONS AS SECRETARY OF DEFENSE WITHIN SEVEN YEARS OF RELIEF FROM ACTIVE DUTY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on passage of the bill (S. 84) to provide for an exception to a limitation against appointment of persons as Secretary of Defense within seven years of relief from active duty as a regular commissioned officer of the Armed Forces, on which a recorded vote was ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 268, noes 151, answered “present” 1, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 59]

## AYES—268

Abraham  
Aderholt  
Allen  
Amodei  
Arrington  
Babin  
Bacon  
Banks (IN)  
Barletta  
Barr  
Barton  
Bera  
Bergman  
Beutler  
Beyer  
Biggs  
Bilirakis

Bishop (MI)  
Bishop (UT)  
Black  
Blackburn  
Blum  
Bost  
Brady (TX)  
Brat  
Bridenstine  
Brooks (AL)  
Brooks (IN)  
Brownley (CA)  
Buck  
Bucshon  
Budd  
Burgess  
Byrne

Calvert  
Carter (GA)  
Carter (TX)  
Cartwright  
Chabot  
Chaffetz  
Cheney  
Coffman  
Cohen  
Cole  
Collins (GA)  
Collins (NY)  
Comer  
Comstock  
Conaway  
Connolly  
Cook

Cooper  
Correa  
Costa  
Costello (PA)  
Cramer  
Crawford  
Crist  
Cuellar  
Culberson  
Curbelo (FL)  
Davidson  
Davis, Rodney  
DeFazio  
Delaney  
Denham  
Dent  
DeSantis  
DesJarlais  
Diaz-Balart  
Donovan  
Duffy  
Duncan (SC)  
Duncan (TN)  
Dunn  
Emmer  
Eshoo  
Farenthold  
Faso  
Ferguson  
Fitzpatrick  
Fleischmann  
Flores  
Fortenberry  
Foxy  
Franks (AZ)  
Frelinghuysen  
Gaetz  
Gallagher  
Garrett  
Gibbs  
Gohmert  
Goodlatte  
Gosar  
Gottheimer  
Gowdy  
Granger  
Graves (GA)  
Graves (LA)  
Graves (MO)  
Griffith  
Grothman  
Guthrie  
Harper  
Harris  
Hartzler  
Hensarling  
Hice, Jody B.  
Higgins (LA)  
Hill  
Holding  
Hollingsworth  
Hudson  
Huizenga  
Hultgren  
Hunter  
Hurd  
Issa  
Jenkins (KS)  
Jenkins (WV)  
Johnson (LA)  
Johnson (OH)  
Johnson, Sam  
Jordan

Joyce (OH)  
Katko  
Keating  
Kelly (MS)  
Kelly (PA)  
King (IA)  
King (NY)  
Kinzinger  
Knight  
Kuster (NH)  
Kustoff (TN)  
Labrador  
LaHood  
LaMalfa  
Lamborn  
Lance  
Latta  
Lewis (MN)  
LoBiondo  
Loeb sack  
Long  
Loudermilk  
Love  
Lucas  
Luetkemeyer  
MacArthur  
Maloney, Sean  
Marchant  
Marino  
Marshall  
Mast  
McCarthy  
McCaul  
McClintock  
McHenry  
McKinley  
McMorris  
Rodgers  
McSally  
Meadows  
Meehan  
Messer  
Mitchell  
Moolenaar  
Mooney (WV)  
Moulton  
Mullin  
Murphy (PA)  
Newhouse  
Noem  
Nolan  
Norcross  
Nunes  
O'Halleran  
Olson  
Palazzo  
Palmer  
Panetta  
Pascarell  
Paulsen  
Pearce  
Perlmutter  
Perry  
Peterson  
Pittenger  
Poe (TX)  
Poliquin  
Posey  
Ratcliffe  
Reed  
Reichert  
Renacci

Rice (SC)  
Roby  
Roe (TN)  
Rogers (AL)  
Rogers (KY)  
Rohrabacher  
Rokita  
Rooney, Francis  
Rooney, Thomas  
J.  
Ros-Lehtinen  
Roskam  
Ross  
Rothfus  
Rouzer  
Royce (CA)  
Ruppersberger  
Russell  
Ryan (OH)  
Sanford  
Scalise  
Schweikert  
Scott, Austin  
Scott, David  
Sensenbrenner  
Sessions  
Sherman  
Shimkus  
Shuster  
Simpson  
Sinema  
Sires  
Smith (MO)  
Smith (NE)  
Smith (NJ)  
Smith (TX)  
Smucker  
Stefanik  
Stewart  
Stivers  
Suozi  
Taylor  
Tenney  
Thompson (CA)  
Thompson (PA)  
Thornberry  
Tiberi  
Tipton  
Trott  
Turner  
Upton  
Valadao  
Walberg  
Walden  
Walker  
Walorski  
Walters, Mimi  
Walz  
Weber (TX)  
Webster (FL)  
Wenstrup  
Westerman  
Williams  
Wilson (SC)  
Wittman  
Womack  
Woodall  
Yoder  
Yoho  
Young (AK)  
Young (IA)  
Zeldin

## NOES—151

Adams  
Aguilar  
Amash  
Barragán  
Bass  
Beatty  
Bishop (GA)  
Blumenauer  
Blunt Rochester  
Bonamici  
Boyle, Brendan  
F.  
Brady (PA)  
Brown (MD)  
Bustos  
Butterfield  
Capuano  
Carbajal  
Cárdenas  
Carson (IN)  
Castor (FL)  
Castro (TX)  
Chu, Judy  
Cicilline

Clark (MA)  
Clarke (NY)  
Clay  
Conyers  
Courtney  
Crowley  
Cummings  
Davis (CA)  
Davis, Danny  
DeGette  
DeLauro  
DelBene  
Demings  
DeSaulnier  
Deutch  
Dingell  
Doggett  
Doyle, Michael  
F.  
Ellison  
Engel  
Espallat  
Esty  
Evans

Foster  
Fudge  
Gabbard  
Gallego  
Garamendi  
Gonzalez (TX)  
Green, Al  
Grijalva  
Gutiérrez  
Hanabusa  
Hastings  
Heck  
Higgins (NY)  
Himes  
Hoyer  
Huffman  
Jackson Lee  
Jayapal  
Jeffries  
Johnson (GA)  
Kaptur  
Kelly (IL)  
Kennedy  
Khanna

Kihuen	Meeks	Schrader
Kildee	Meng	Scott (VA)
Kilmer	Moore	Serrano
Kind	Murphy (FL)	Sewell (AL)
Krishnamoorthi	Nadler	Shea-Porter
Langevin	Napolitano	Slaughter
Larsen (WA)	Neal	Smith (WA)
Larson (CT)	O'Rourke	Soto
Lawrence	Pallone	Speier
Lawson (FL)	Payne	Swalwell (CA)
Lee	Pelosi	Takano
Levin	Peters	Thompson (MS)
Lewis (GA)	Pingree	Titus
Lieu, Ted	Pocan	Tonko
Lofgren	Polis	Torres
Lowenthal	Price (NC)	Tsongas
Lowey	Quigley	Vargas
Lujan Grisham,	Raskin	Veasey
M.	Rice (NY)	Vela
Luján, Ben Ray	Richmond	Velázquez
Lynch	Rosen	Visclosky
Maloney,	Roybal-Allard	Wasserman
Carolyn B.	Ruiz	Schultz
Matsui	Sánchez	Waters, Maxine
McCollum	Sarbanes	Watson Coleman
McEachin	Schakowsky	Welch
McGovern	Schiff	Wilson (FL)
McNerney	Schneider	Yarmuth

## ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Lipinski

## NOT VOTING—14

Becerra	Green, Gene	Price, Tom (GA)
Buchanan	Johnson, E. B.	Rush
Cleaver	Jones	Rutherford
Clyburn	Mulvaney	Zinke
Frankel (FL)	Pompeo	

□ 1537

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on rollcall No. 57. "Nay" on rollcall No. 58. "Nay" on rollcall No. 59.

## THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal, which the Chair will put de novo.

The question is on the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

## ELECTING MEMBERS TO CERTAIN STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the House Republican Conference, I offer a privileged resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 51

*Resolved*, That the following named Members be, and are hereby, elected to the following standing committees of the House of Representatives:

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE: Mr. Goodlatte, Mr. Lucas, Mr. King of Iowa, Mr. Rogers of Alabama, Mr. Thompson of Pennsylvania, Mr. Gibbs, Mr. Austin Scott of Georgia, Mr. Crawford, Mr. DesJarlais, Mrs. Hartzler, Mr. Denham, Mr. LaMalfa, Mr.

Rodney Davis of Illinois, Mr. Yoho, Mr. Allen, Mr. Bost, Mr. Rouzer, Mr. Abraham, Mr. Kelly of Mississippi, Mr. Comer, Mr. Marshall, Mr. Bacon, Mr. Faso, Mr. Dunn, and Mr. Arrington.

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND THE WORKFORCE: Mr. Wilson of South Carolina, Mr. Hunter, Mr. Roe of Tennessee, Mr. Thompson of Pennsylvania, Mr. Walberg, Mr. Guthrie, Mr. Rokita, Mr. Barletta, Mr. Messer, Mr. Byrne, Mr. Brat, Mr. Bishop of Michigan, Mr. Grotham, Ms. Stefanik, Mr. Allen, Mr. Lewis of Minnesota, Mr. Francis Rooney of Florida, Mr. Mitchell, Mr. Garrett, Mr. Smucker, and Mr. Ferguson.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS: Mr. Smith of New Jersey, Ms. Ros-Lehtinen, Mr. Rohrabacher, Mr. Chabot, Mr. Wilson of South Carolina, Mr. McCaul, Mr. Poe of Texas, Mr. Issa, Mr. Marino, Mr. Duncan of South Carolina, Mr. Brooks of Alabama, Mr. Cook, Mr. Perry, Mr. DeSantis, Mr. Meadows, Mr. Yoho, Mr. Kinzinger, Mr. Zeldin, Mr. Donovan, Mr. Sensenbrenner, Mrs. Wagner, Mr. Mast, Mr. Francis Rooney of Florida, Mr. Fitzpatrick, and Mr. Garrett.

COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY: Mr. Smith of Texas, Mr. King of New York, Mr. Rogers of Alabama, Mr. Duncan of South Carolina, Mr. Marino, Mr. Barletta, Mr. Perry, Mr. Katko, Mr. Hurd, Ms. McCally, Mr. Ratcliffe, Mr. Donovan, Mr. Gallagher, Mr. Higgins of Louisiana, Mr. Rutherford, Mr. Garrett, and Mr. Fitzpatrick.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY: Mr. Sensenbrenner, Mr. Smith of Texas, Mr. Chabot, Mr. Issa, Mr. King of Iowa, Mr. Franks of Arizona, Mr. Gohmert, Mr. Jordan, Mr. Poe of Texas, Mr. Chaffetz, Mr. Marino, Mr. Gowdy, Mr. Labrador, Mr. Farenthold, Mr. Collins of Georgia, Mr. DeSantis, Mr. Buck, Mr. Ratcliffe, Mr. Bishop of Michigan, Mrs. Roby, Mr. Gaetz, Mr. Johnson of Louisiana, and Mr. Biggs.

COMMITTEE ON NATURAL RESOURCES: Mr. Young of Alaska, Mr. Gohmert, Mr. Lamborn, Mr. Wittman, Mr. McClintock, Mr. Pearce, Mr. Thompson of Pennsylvania, Mr. Gosar, Mr. Labrador, Mr. Tipton, Mr. LaMalfa, Mr. Denham, Mr. Cook, Mr. Westerman, Mr. Graves of Louisiana, Mr. Jody B. Hice of Georgia, Mrs. Radewagen, Mr. LaHood, Mr. Webster of Florida, Mr. Rouzer, Mr. Bergman, Ms. Cheney, Mr. Johnson of Louisiana, and Miss Gonzalez-Colon of Puerto Rico.

COMMITTEE ON OVERSIGHT AND GOVERNMENT REFORM: Mr. Duncan of Tennessee, Mr. Issa, Mr. Jordan, Mr. Sanford, Mr. Amash, Mr. Gosar, Mr. DesJarlais, Mr. Gowdy, Mr. Farenthold, Ms. Foxx, Mr. Massie, Mr. Meadows, Mr. DeSantis, Mr. Ross, Mr. Walker, Mr. Blum, Mr. Jody B. Hice of Georgia, Mr. Russell, Mr. Grothman, Mr. Hurd, Mr. Palmer, Mr. Comer, and Mr. Mitchell.

COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE, SPACE, AND TECHNOLOGY: Mr. Rohrabacher, Mr. Lucas, Mr. Brooks of Alabama, Mr. Hultgren, Mr. Posey, Mr. Massie, Mr. Bridenstine, Mr. Weber of Texas, Mr. Knight, Mr. Babin, Mrs. Comstock, Mr. Palmer, Mr. Loudermilk, Mr. Abraham, Mr. LaHood, Mr. Webster of Florida, Mr. Banks of Indiana, Mr. Biggs, Mr. Marshall, Mr. Dunn, and Mr. Higgins of Louisiana.

COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS: Mr. King of Iowa, Mr. Luetkemeyer, Mr. Brat, Mrs. Radewagen, Mr. Knight, Mr. Kelly of Mississippi, Mr. Blum, Mr. Comer, Miss Gonzalez-Colon of Puerto Rico, Mr. Bacon, Mr. Fitzpatrick, and Mr. Marshall.

COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION AND INFRASTRUCTURE: Mr. Young of Alaska, Mr. Duncan of Tennessee, Mr. LoBiondo, Mr. Graves of Missouri, Mr. Hunter, Mr. Crawford, Mr. Barletta, Mr. Farenthold, Mr. Gibbs, Mr. Webster of Florida, Mr. Denham, Mr. Massie, Mr. Meadows, Mr. Perry, Mr. Rodney Davis

of Illinois, Mr. Sanford, Mr. Woodall, Mr. Rokita, Mr. Katko, Mr. Babin, Mr. Graves of Louisiana, Mrs. Comstock, Mr. Rouzer, Mr. Bost, Mr. Weber of Texas, Mr. LaMalfa, Mr. Westerman, Mr. Smucker, Mr. Mitchell, Mr. Faso, Mr. Ferguson, Mr. Mast, and Mr. Lewis of Minnesota.

COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS: Mr. Bilirakis, Mr. Coffman, Mr. Wenstrup, Mrs. Radewagen, Mr. Bost, Mr. Poliquin, Mr. Dunn, Mr. Arrington, Mr. Rutherford, Mr. Higgins of Louisiana, Mr. Bergman, Mr. Banks of Indiana, and Miss Gonzalez-Colon of Puerto Rico.

Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Washington?

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## ADJOURNMENT FROM FRIDAY, JANUARY 13, 2017, TO TUESDAY, JANUARY 17, 2017

Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at noon on Tuesday, January 17, 2017.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Washington?

There was no objection.

## RESIGNATION AS MEMBER OF COMMITTEE ON OVERSIGHT AND GOVERNMENT REFORM

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following resignation as a member of the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
Washington, DC, January 13, 2017.

Hon. PAUL D. RYAN,  
Speaker of the House,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR SPEAKER RYAN: I, Brendan F. Boyle, am submitting my resignation from the Oversight and Government Reform Committee effective immediately. It has been a privilege and honor to have served on this committee.

Sincerely,

BRENDAN F. BOYLE,  
Member of Congress.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the resignation is accepted.

There was no objection.

## RESIGNATION AS MEMBER OF COMMITTEE ON OVERSIGHT AND GOVERNMENT REFORM

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following resignation as a member of the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
Washington, DC, January 13, 2017.

Hon. PAUL D. RYAN,  
Speaker of the House, Washington, DC.

DEAR SPEAKER RYAN: I, Ted W. Lieu, am submitting my resignation from the House

Oversight and Government Reform Committee effective immediately. It has been a privilege and honor to have served on this committee.

Sincerely,

TED W. LIEU,  
Member of Congress.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the resignation is accepted. There was no objection.

#### ELECTING MEMBERS TO CERTAIN STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Democratic Caucus, I offer a privileged resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 52

*Resolved*, That the following named Members be and are hereby elected to the following standing committees of the House of Representatives:

(1) COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE.—Ms. Blunt Rochester.

(2) COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET.—Ms. Wasserman Schultz, Mr. Brendan F. Boyle of Pennsylvania, Mr. Khanna, Ms. Jayapal, and Mr. Carbajal.

(3) COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS.—Mr. Ted Lieu of California.

(4) COMMITTEE ON NATURAL RESOURCES.—Ms. Hanabusa, Ms. Barragán, Mr. Soto, Mr. Panetta, Mr. McEachin, and Mr. Brown of Maryland.

(5) COMMITTEE ON OVERSIGHT AND GOVERNMENT REFORM.—Mrs. Demings, Mr. Krishnamoorthi, and Mr. Raskin.

(6) COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE, SPACE, AND TECHNOLOGY.—Ms. Rosen.

(7) COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS.—Mr. Evans and Mrs. Murphy of Florida.

(8) COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS.—Mr. Correa.

Mr. CROWLEY (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### RECOGNIZING MARY FRANCES REPKO

(Mr. HOYER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, every one of us who serves in this House relies on the talented and hardworking staff of ours and of the House itself. We couldn't do what we do without them. They not only serve us faithfully, but serve our constituents as well, and they often do so without recognition.

Today my colleagues and I want to recognize someone who has been serving the people of Maryland's Fifth District and our country as a senior member of my staff for a decade and, indeed, before that, on the Senate side for close to a decade as well.

Many of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle have come to know Mary

Frances Repko. If you have dealt with the environment, if you have dealt with energy, or if you have dealt with the history of the Senate and the House on energy legislation and environmental legislation over the last 20 years, you know Mary Frances Repko.

Mr. Speaker, many of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle know Mary Frances well and respect her deep intellect, her professionalism, and her sage counsel. When it comes to energy policy and environmental issues, there are few on this Hill who know more of the intricacies and complexities of the issues than she does.

I am very proud of Mary Frances because the leadership staffs on both the Democratic and Republican side engage her in order to ensure that all the facts and ramifications of energy and environmental legislation are known and considered.

Mary Frances has been integrally involved in every major energy and environmental legislative debate over the past 10 years.

I know Leader PELOSI is also a great admirer of Mary Frances Repko. Her staff and Mary Frances have worked very closely together, including on the Recovery Act, the American Clean Energy and Security Act, the Energy Independence and Security Act, the EPA Act of 2005, the Renewable Fuel Standard, the BP oil spill, flood insurance, Hurricane Sandy relief, the Water Resources Development Act, the Flint water crisis, the Toxic Substances Control Act, the Land and Water Conservation Fund, land conservation bills, transportation bills, and fighting partisan antienvironmental riders—an extraordinary history of deep and effective involvement on the issues.

□ 1545

She has also been my lead staff on Puerto Rico, working closely with the Resident Commissioner's staff to help the people of the island through a debt crisis and Zika. For the past 4 years, she has also been the lead staffer for House Democrats' Make It In America plan for investing in job creation and making opportunities more accessible to American workers.

When Mary Frances first came to the whip's office in 2007, I felt fortunate to have enticed her to leave the United States Senate, where she had served as a senior policy adviser for the Committee on the Environment and Public Works. Earlier, she had served as Senator CANTWELL's legislative director, and as legislative staffer for former Senator Russ Feingold.

Now it is with a great sadness that we must wish her farewell and send her back to the Senate, where she will return to the Environment and Public Works Committee as its new deputy staff director.

Ms. PELOSI. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOYER. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I thank Whip HOYER for yielding and for calling attention to the serious loss the House will suffer with Mary Frances leaving.

The first thing that I am inclined to say is: Mary Frances, say it isn't so. We so depend on your wisdom, your knowledge, your judgment, your advice, and guidance on all of the issues that the distinguished whip has mentioned.

The appreciation for Mary Frances goes well beyond the whip's office, throughout the leadership, and our caucus and, I think, across the aisle, certainly across the Capitol.

I was hoping in the last couple of days that the decision might be reversed, but Mary Frances, we wish her well. We are not sending her, Mr. HOYER, to the Senate. She is going to the Senate. But it is wonderful to know that the Senate will be blessed with her great leadership, knowledge, wisdom, judgment, and beautiful temperament.

Mary Frances, thank you. Don't be a stranger to us. We look forward to continuing our work together to preserve our planet, to create jobs in our country, to do so many things that are a part of your values and our values.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I know that Mary Frances very much appreciates the words of Leader PELOSI. I know that the leader is absolutely correct: we are not sending her. She is going.

But I want to tell the leader and tell this House that I talked to Senator CARPER, who is the chairman of the committee, and I said: TOM, I will not stand in the schoolhouse door, if you will, and not let her out of our office; but you must pledge that she will be available for our calls and for our questions on a regular basis.

Madam Leader, he assures me that that is the case. I thank the gentleman for the comments.

Mr. Speaker, our loss, though, is the Senate's gain. I have no doubt that Mary Frances will bring her talents, her wisdom, and her Michigan-bred can-do attitude to the important work the committee will undertake this Congress and in the years ahead.

I hope all of my colleagues and, indeed, the American people we serve will join me in thanking Mary Frances Repko for her contributions to the work of this House and to the service she has given to our country during her time as a member of the staff of the Senate and the House.

I hope you will all join me in wishing her great success in her new position, in which I can assure you she will not be a stranger to us in the House, but a crucial liaison to the work of the Environment and Public Works Committee just across the hall.

Thank you, Mary Frances. Thank you for a job well done and for your service and wise counsel.

# MARTIN LUTHER KING JR. DAY OF SERVICE AT CENTRAL PENNSYLVANIA FOOD BANK

(Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, I will honor Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr.'s, legacy by volunteering my time to help veterans in my community. Congressman SCOTT PERRY of Pennsylvania's Fourth District and I will be at the Central Pennsylvania Food Bank in Harrisburg to pack boxes for the MilitaryShare program.

MilitaryShare is a program that serves fresh, nutritious meals to families with at least one member who has served in the military. This program assists area veterans and their families to ensure they do not go hungry.

Our veterans have numerous needs when they leave the military, and many of them are life-threatening challenges as a result of combat such as post-traumatic stress injury. When we help meet the nutritional needs of military families, it allows them to focus on other pressing issues such as joblessness or treatment for combat-related health issues.

MilitaryShare serves more than 4,000 households in central Pennsylvania, which translates to about 10,000 people a month.

Mr. Speaker, to serve one's country is a noble and selfless act. The very least we can do is to help our veterans transition to civilian life when they return home.

# RECOGNITION OF NATIONAL MENTORING MONTH AND YOUTH MENTORS ACROSS THE NATION

(Mr. LANGEVIN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in recognition of National Mentoring Month and in honor of the youth mentors across Rhode Island and the Nation.

Every day, mentors enrich the lives of young people. They are powerful role models who provide essential support for at-risk youth.

Just some of examples of the powerful impact that mentors have in the life of young people are that vulnerable young people with mentors are more likely to enroll in college and volunteer more regularly than their peers. They are 46 percent less likely to start using drugs and 52 percent less likely to skip school.

They are also more likely to develop self-confidence, form healthy relationships, and cultivate productive habits.

Organizations like the Rhode Island Mentoring Partnership and Big Brothers Big Sisters lead the way in the Ocean State. Organizations like this and mentors across the country are im-

proving our communities one child at a time, and I am proud to honor them as we recognize National Mentoring Month this January 2017. I encourage more people to step forward and serve as mentors and make a difference in the lives of young people.

# THE PRESIDENT SHOULD DESIGNATE THE IRGC AS A TERRORIST ORGANIZATION

(Mr. POE of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, Iran is the world's leading state sponsor of terrorism. It funds and controls terrorists groups like Hezbollah. Its tentacles stretch all over the world, far beyond the Middle East.

Many of its activities are done through the Iranian Revolutionary Guard Corps, which has funded, planned, and executed terrorist attacks in the United States and elsewhere for decades.

The IRGC is the parent organization of the Quds Force and is directly responsible for its terrorist activities worldwide. But somehow this group has managed to escape repercussions, and the United States has never recognized it as a terrorist organization. I am working to change that.

This week I introduced the IRGC Terrorist Sanctions Act. This bill will require the President to designate the IRGC for its terrorist activity and levy the relevant statutory sanctions against it.

It is time to close loopholes like these that allow terrorist-affiliated groups to continue their reign of terror. Designate and sanction these terrorist groups that are sponsored by the number one world state sponsor of terrorism, Iran.

And that is just the way it is.

# SHAM AND SCAM

(Ms. TITUS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. TITUS. Mr. Speaker, the Republicans just voted to begin the repeal of the Affordable Care Act. Their misguided and heartless effort will not just affect thousands of insurance policies in Nevada, but it will cost the State jobs, it will diminish access to health care, and it will jeopardize lives.

Nevada had one of the highest uninsured rates in the country before the ACA. Since then, we have cut the rate by almost 50 percent, and we have created a system that now provides 400,000 children and adults with coverage. But Trump and the congressional Republicans don't want to hear about that.

Make no mistake, when they voted to repeal the ACA, they are revoking vital programs that offer cancer screenings and mental health assistance. They are rescinding provisions that prevent insurance companies from charging

women more than men, or from denying benefits because of preexisting conditions.

This is unconscionable. Instead of repeal and replace, the Republicans should just call their proposal "destroy and delay," or perhaps just simply "scam and sham."

# RUSSIAN THREAT TO U.S. DEMOCRACY

(Ms. KAPTUR asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, the freedom to live in a democratic society with freedom of speech, assembly, press, and religion are rights Americans hold most precious.

Not so in Putin's Russia. Putin's Russia brutally invaded Ukraine in 2013, resulting, to date, in over 10,000 war dead, with millions of displaced persons. The war grinds on.

Dozens and dozens of Putin's critics in the press have ended up dead, murdered for expressing their views. In 2015, Boris Nemstov, about to lead an assembly in favor of Ukrainian independence in Moscow, was murdered on the stairs near the Kremlin.

Georgiy Gongadze, editor of the news Website Ukrayinska Pravda, featured critical articles about Putin ally Leonid Kuchma. He disappeared in the year 2000, and his headless body was discovered in a forest more than 40 miles from home.

Anna Politkovskaya, a Russian journalist, was murdered in the elevator of her block of flats in 2006.

And Paul Klebnikov, an American, who was chief editor of the Russian edition of Forbes, was killed in 2004, likely by hired assassins.

All dead, no investigations, no justice. This is Putin's Russia.

President-elect Trump best be very wary of whom he showers praise upon, for the cock is crowing too close to home.

# COMMEMORATING THE SEVENTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE EARTHQUAKE IN HAITI

(Ms. LEE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to commemorate the anniversary of the devastating earthquake that struck the nation of Haiti on January 12, 2010. This Thursday marked 7 years since a magnitude 7.0 earthquake struck Haiti's capital, Port-au-Prince, killing Haiti's population center and the seat of its government.

The aftermath of the quake was unimaginable. 316,000 people perished, and 1.3 million were displaced. This tragedy struck a nation already hobbled by grinding poverty, health disparities, and food insecurity. Approximately 147,000 people remain internally displaced in Haiti, with countless others displaced outside IDP camps.

The world and the American people, though, responded to the earthquake with generosity. To date, the United States has contributed billions to recovery efforts, along with donors from around the world.

The Assessing Progress in Haiti Act, which was a bipartisan effort with Congresswoman ILEANA ROS-LEHTINEN and was signed into law 3 years ago, provides us critical oversight to ensure that aid continues in the most effective way possible.

Unfortunately, more work needs to be done. Haiti continues to be struck by natural disasters, including severe drought and devastating effects of Hurricane Matthew in 2016.

#### WE ARE MAKING A MISTAKE IF WE REPEAL OBAMACARE

(Mr. ENGEL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, the Affordable Care Act has improved the health care and financial security of every American, regardless of where he or she gets health insurance.

Healthcare costs have been growing at the slowest rate in more than 50 years. Seniors in the so-called Medicare doughnut hole have saved more than \$23 billion on their prescription drugs. Every American woman can rest easier knowing that women are no longer charged more than men for the same coverage. And 137 million Americans with private insurance now receive free preventive services.

Despite this remarkable progress, the majority has made it their mission to destroy the Affordable Care Act, no matter the cost, and those costs would extend far beyond the healthcare system.

A recent report found that repeal would cause just New York to lose more than 130,000 jobs in 2019 alone.

The Affordable Care Act has reduced the burden of healthcare costs for hard-working families not only in New York, but across the Nation; and it is those Americans for whom repeal would be so devastating.

We are making a mistake if we repeal ObamaCare.

□ 1600

#### SUPPORT OF THE AFFORDABLE CARE ACT

(Mr. EVANS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. EVANS. Mr. Speaker, I stood in the well of this House some days ago, when I was sworn in, and basically said that I am not naive.

Today, I rise in support of the Affordable Care Act and oppose any effort to repeal it, which just took place. Since the ACA was enacted in 2010, the uninsured rate in Pennsylvania has fallen by 37 percent. Additionally, millions

more Pennsylvanians, who would otherwise be uninsured, have coverage with an employer, Medicaid, individual market, or Medicare coverage as a result of the new protections provided by the law.

No matter what lens you look through, Pennsylvanians and individuals throughout our Nation have better health coverage and care today as a result of the ACA. Let us keep moving forward and help our communities have healthcare access, quality, and affordability.

Recently, our Pennsylvania Governor, Tom Wolf, sent a letter to Majority Leader KEVIN MCCARTHY to underscore the importance of furthering access to care, keeping prices affordable and spending in check, and improving health care for those in our home State of Pennsylvania.

Just in Pennsylvania alone, we have had over 670,000 individuals who have enrolled in HealthChoices, Pennsylvania's mandatory managed care Medicaid program. That is 670,000 individuals who previously did not have access to quality of care.

We do not need the rhetoric of repeal and replace.

COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA,  
OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR,  
Harrisburg, PA, December 20, 2016.

Hon. KEVIN MCCARTHY,  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN MCCARTHY: Thank you for the opportunity to weigh in on the critically important conversation about the future of health care in our country. As Governor of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, I am immensely proud of the work we have done to further access to care, keep prices affordable and spending in check, and improve health outcomes since my administration began tackling health care as a top priority.

One of my first decisions as Governor was to expand Medicaid to individuals up to 138 percent of Federal Poverty Level (FPL). Since that decision was made in February 2015, more than 670,000 individuals have enrolled in HealthChoices, Pennsylvania's mandatory managed care Medicaid program. That's 670,000 Pennsylvanians that previously did not have access to quality care, if they had access to care at all. Total program enrollment now tops 2.8 million Pennsylvanians. U.S. Census data shows that the commonwealth's uninsured rate has dropped from 10.2 percent in 2010 to 6.4 percent in 2015, and state General Fund costs have been reduced by more than \$500 million as a result of Medicaid expansion.

Even before the passage of the Affordable Care Act, Medicaid was the largest single payer in the United States for behavioral health services, including mental health and substance use services. In the midst of an exploding heroin use and opioid abuse epidemic that is gripping Pennsylvania and the nation, the role that Medicaid plays in addressing this epidemic cannot be understated. More than 3,500 Pennsylvanians died from heroin and opioid-related overdoses last year and that number is expected to rise again in 2016. However, in the first year of Pennsylvania's Medicaid expansion, almost 63,000 newly eligible Medicaid enrollees accessed drug and alcohol treatment. Demands on the treatment system are growing by the day but Medicaid expansion has opened the door to treatment that otherwise would not be available, much less affordable, to those without insurance.

Of course, the benefits of the Affordable Care Act (ACA) are not limited to those with Medicaid. The ACA has had far-reaching positive impacts on every community in Pennsylvania. In 2016, more than 439,000 people had selected health coverage through the Marketplace.

Seventy six percent of those Pennsylvanians received subsidies to make those plans more affordable. In 2016, 60 percent of those enrollees could obtain coverage for \$100 or less after tax credits. For a family, that may be the difference between choosing to pay for food for dinner or having stable health insurance. In addition, several pieces of the ACA, including the provision that allows children to remain on their parents' insurance until age 26 and the provision that requires coverage of pre-existing conditions, have made the benefits of health insurance coverage more enticing than ever before.

Nonprofits that have historically served as the safety nets of our health care system saw some relief with the passage of the ACA. For many, this meant they could finally bill for some of the services that they've typically provided for free for individuals who are uninsured. To shift the burden back on to these providers to serve an enormous influx of people who would lose access to insurance under an ACA repeal is doing a disservice to our nonprofit partners and our communities. The upheaval would be instant and real and would devastate families that have finally been able to set aside health coverage from their list of daily worries.

I respectfully ask that you carefully consider the needs of the people as you move forward with discussions about the future of the ACA. All too often we get swept up in the politics and financial impacts to large businesses and big political donors and forget that these are real people, who suffer from real diseases and every day maladies. Americans need real, meaningful health care coverage. They need options that are affordable, easy to understand, responsive to their needs, and available immediately—with no lapse in coverage. They need leadership and compassion and solutions—and together, we can provide them with all of those things.

I look forward to future conversations. Thank you again for the opportunity to contribute to this incredibly important dialogue.

Sincerely,

TOM WOLF,  
Governor.

#### APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS TO THE PERMANENT SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GARRETT). The Chair announces the Speaker's appointment, pursuant to clause 11 of rule X, clause 11 of rule I, and the order of the House of January 3, 2017, of the following Members of the House to the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence:

Mr. CRAWFORD, Arkansas  
Mr. GOWDY, South Carolina  
Ms. STEFANIK, New York

#### OATH OF OFFICE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2017, the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. FORTENBERRY) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. FORTENBERRY. Mr. Speaker, given that last week I took the oath of

office as a Member of the new 115th Congress of the United States and given that next week we will watch President-elect Trump also take the oath of office, I want to share a few thoughts on the deep importance of this constitutional duty that we share.

Mr. Speaker, as you are aware, last week on Capitol Hill was marked by a day of celebration. It was a day of renewal of friendships, even between people who have deep, deep disagreements in this body. Families and guests all gathered to share in the moment's excitement and meaning, and Members of Congress congratulated one another on their recent victories. We all took a reprieve from the intensity of the policy debate for just a moment. But amidst all of that swirl of activity, the day was set apart by the oath of office.

Mr. Speaker, the oath lays down a clear marker of the serious obligations ahead for all of us. In our day and time, we no longer are deeply connected to this concept of oath. We see it in the courtroom when somebody is required to tell the truth. We will see it again next week when President-elect Trump is sworn in. But we rarely take the time to reflect on its deeper meaning.

We see it more like an old tradition, a nostalgic option that we exercise out of deference to our history. However, the oath is much, much more. It is a solemn declaration. It is a pause, the start of sacred duty.

By taking an oath, you effectively hold your very self at ransom. You commit, at the deepest levels, that you will perform the tasks ahead of you to the best of your ability.

The oath is the ultimate test and measure of integrity. If you violate it, you tear at the center of your being, to the detriment of not only yourself but to the community, to those you are sworn to serve. This is a very high bar, indeed, Mr. Speaker.

I am reminded of the words of Sir Thomas More, who was the Lord High Chancellor of England during the 16th century. He strove to live a life worthy of excellence in public service. But in the end, he was put to death by the very state that he sought to so nobly serve.

In an earlier reflection on the idea of oath, Sir Thomas More had this to say: "When a man takes an oath, he's holding his own self in his own hands like water, and if he opens his fingers then, he needn't hope to find himself again."

Mr. Speaker, throughout that wonderful day last week of our swearing in here in the body, I was reflecting personally on a singular word. That word is replenishment.

Our American system of governance has an extraordinary capacity to replenish itself with new ideas, new people, and refreshed perspectives. Our political system starts with the belief that political power is derived from each person's dignity.

By voting, citizens invest that very power in the Representatives that are

sent here to make judgments on their behalf. But, of course, to earn that right in the first place, the Representative must make his case to the people. In spite of the drama, in spite of the raucous nature of elections—and we have just come through one—the fact that America goes through this cycle of constant replenishment is truly an extraordinary gift.

Mr. Speaker, as I stood in the center aisle right here last week, I raised my right hand. I raised it right along with everyone else who is a Member of this new 115th Congress, and I took that oath of office.

Mr. Speaker, I just think it is worthwhile to read these powerful words:

"I do solemnly swear, or affirm, that I will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic; that I will bear true faith and allegiance to the same; that I take this obligation freely, without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion; and that I will well and faithfully discharge the duties of the office on which I am about to enter, so help me God."

Mr. Speaker, indeed, this is a very high bar. This is a sacred duty. This is a solemn task. It sets this body and our system of governance apart by forcing each of us who have been given this extraordinary privilege of taking on the heavy mantle and weighty responsibility of making decisions on behalf of this great country, and to do so to the best of our ability, having put our very self, the integrity of what it means to be a person, on the line to uphold that commitment.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

#### 115TH CONGRESS STAFF DEPOSITION AUTHORITY PROCEDURES

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
COMMITTEE ON RULES,  
WASHINGTON, DC, JANUARY 13, 2017.

Hon. PAUL D. RYAN,  
*Speaker, House of Representatives,*  
*Washington, DC.*

MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to section 3(b)(2) of House Resolution 5, 115th Congress, I hereby submit the following regulations regarding the conduct of depositions by committee and select committee staff for printing in the Congressional Record.

Sincerely,

PETE SESSIONS,  
*Chairman, Committee on Rules.*

#### 115TH CONGRESS STAFF DEPOSITION AUTHORITY PROCEDURES

1. Notices for the taking of depositions shall specify the date, time, and place of examination (if other than within the committee offices). Depositions shall be taken under oath administered by a member or a person otherwise authorized to administer oaths.

2. Consultation with the ranking minority member shall include three days notice before any deposition is taken. All members of the committee shall also receive three days notice that a deposition will be taken. For purposes of these procedures, a day shall not include Saturdays, Sundays, or legal holidays except when the House is in session on such a day.

3. Witnesses may be accompanied at a deposition by personal, nongovernmental coun-

sel to advise them of their rights. Only members, committee staff designated by the chair or ranking minority member, an official reporter, the witness, and the witness's counsel are permitted to attend. The chair of the committee that noticed the deposition may designate that deposition as part of a joint investigation between committees. If such a designation is made, the chair and ranking minority member of the committee that provided notice of such deposition may each also designate up to two committee staff from committees designated as part of the joint investigation to attend the deposition after consultation with the chair or ranking minority member of the designated committees. Observers or counsel for other persons, including counsel for government agencies, may not attend.

4. If member attendance is required, the deposition will stand in recess for any period in which a member is not present.

5. A deposition shall be conducted by any member or staff attorney designated by the chair or ranking minority member. When depositions are conducted by committee staff attorneys, there shall be no more than two committee staff attorneys permitted to question a witness per round. One of the committee staff attorneys shall be designated by the chair and the other by the ranking minority member per round. Other committee staff members designated by the chair or ranking minority member, including designated staff from additional committees in the case of a joint investigation, may attend, but may not question the witness.

6. Deposition questions shall be propounded in rounds. The length of each round shall be determined by the chair after consultation with the ranking minority member, shall not exceed 90 minutes per side, and shall provide equal time to the majority and the minority. In each round, a member or committee staff attorney designated by the chair shall ask questions first, and the member or committee staff attorney designated by the ranking minority member shall ask questions second.

7. Only the witness or the witness's personal counsel may make objections during a deposition. Objections must be stated concisely and in a non-argumentative and non-suggestive manner. A committee may punish counsel who violate these requirements by censure, and by suspension or exclusion, either generally or in a particular investigation, from further representation of clients before the committee. A committee may also cite the counsel to the House for contempt. If the witness raises an objection, the deposition will proceed, and testimony taken is subject to any objection. The witness may refuse to answer a question only to preserve a testimonial privilege. When the witness has objected and refused to answer a question to preserve a testimonial privilege, the chair of the committee may rule on any such objection after the deposition has recessed. If the chair overrules any such objection and thereby orders a witness to answer any question to which a testimonial privilege objection was lodged, such ruling shall be filed with the clerk of the committee and shall be provided to the members and the witness no less than three days before the reconvened deposition. If the witness or a member of the committee chooses to appeal the ruling of the chair, such appeal must be made within three days, in writing, and shall be preserved for committee consideration. A deponent who refuses to answer a question after being directed to answer by the chair in writing may be subject to sanction, except that no sanctions may be imposed if the ruling of the chair is reversed on appeal.



8. Committee chairs shall ensure that the testimony is either transcribed or electronically recorded or both. If a witness's testimony is transcribed, the witness or the witness's counsel shall be afforded an opportunity to review a copy. No later than five days after a transcript is made available to the witness, the witness may submit suggested changes to the chair. Committee staff may make any typographical and technical changes. Substantive changes, modifications, clarifications, or amendments to the deposition transcript submitted by the witness must be accompanied by a letter signed by the witness requesting the changes and a statement of the witness's reasons for each proposed change. Any substantive changes, modifications, clarifications, or amendments shall be included as an appendix to the transcript conditioned upon the witness signing the transcript.

9. The individual administering the oath, if other than a member, shall certify on the transcript that the witness was duly sworn. The transcriber shall certify that the transcript is a true record of the testimony, and the transcript shall be filed, together with any electronic recording, with the clerk of the committee in Washington, DC. Depositions shall be considered to have been taken in Washington, DC, as well as the location actually taken once filed there with the clerk of the committee for the committee's use. The chair and the ranking minority member shall be provided with a copy of the transcripts of the deposition at the same time.

10. The chair and ranking minority member shall consult regarding the release of deposition transcripts and recordings. If either objects in writing to a proposed release of a deposition transcript or recording, or a portion thereof, the matter shall be promptly referred to the committee for resolution.

11. A witness shall not be required to testify unless the witness has been provided with a copy of Rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives and these procedures.

## PUBLICATION OF COMMITTEE RULES

### RULES OF THE COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES FOR THE 115TH CONGRESS

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I respectfully submit the Rules of the Committee on Armed Services for the 115th Congress, as adopted by the committee on January 12, 2017.

#### RULE 1. GENERAL PROVISIONS

(a) The Rules of the House of Representatives are the rules of the Committee on Armed Services (hereinafter referred to in these rules as the "Committee") and its subcommittees so far as applicable.

(b) Pursuant to clause 2(a)(2) of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the Committee's rules shall be publicly available in electronic form and published in the Congressional Record not later than 30 days after the chair of the committee is elected in each odd-numbered year.

#### RULE 2. FULL COMMITTEE MEETING DATE

(a) The Committee shall meet every Wednesday at 10:00 a.m., when the House of Representatives is in session, and at such other times as may be fixed by the Chairman of the Committee (hereinafter referred to as the "Chairman"), or by written request of members of the Committee pursuant to clause 2(c) of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives.

(b) A Wednesday meeting of the Committee may be dispensed with by the Chairman, but

such action may be reversed by a written request of a majority of the members of the Committee.

#### RULE 3. SUBCOMMITTEE MEETING DATES

Each subcommittee is authorized to meet, hold hearings, receive evidence, and report to the Committee on all matters referred to it. Insofar as possible, meetings of the Committee and its subcommittees shall not conflict. A subcommittee Chairman shall set meeting dates after consultation with the Chairman, other subcommittee Chairmen, and the Ranking Minority Member of the subcommittee with a view toward avoiding, whenever possible, simultaneous scheduling of Committee and subcommittee meetings or hearings.

#### RULE 4. JURISDICTION AND MEMBERSHIP OF COMMITTEE AND SUBCOMMITTEES

##### (a) Jurisdiction

(1) The Committee retains jurisdiction of all subjects listed in clause 1(c) and clause 3(b) of rule X of the Rules of the House of Representatives and retains exclusive jurisdiction for: defense policy generally, ongoing military operations, the organization and reform of the Department of Defense and Department of Energy, counter-drug programs, security and humanitarian assistance (except special operations-related activities) of the Department of Defense, acquisition and industrial base policy, technology transfer and export controls, joint interoperability, detainee affairs and policy, force protection policy and inter-agency reform as it pertains to the Department of Defense and the nuclear weapons programs of the Department of Energy. In addition the committee will be responsible for intelligence policy (including coordination of military intelligence programs), national intelligence programs, and Department of Defense elements that are part of the Intelligence Community. While subcommittees are provided jurisdictional responsibilities in subparagraph (2), the Committee retains the right to exercise oversight and legislative jurisdiction over all subjects within its purview under rule X of the Rules of the House of Representatives.

(2) The Committee shall be organized to consist of seven standing subcommittees with the following jurisdictions:

Subcommittee on Tactical Air and Land Forces: All Army, Air Force and Marine Corps acquisition programs (except Marine Corps amphibious assault vehicle programs, strategic missiles, space, lift programs, special operations, science and technology programs, and information technology accounts) and the associated weapons systems sustainment. In addition, the subcommittee will be responsible for Navy and Marine Corps aviation programs and the associated weapons systems sustainment, National Guard and Army, Air Force and Marine Corps Reserve modernization, and ammunition programs.

Subcommittee on Military Personnel: Military personnel policy, Reserve Component integration and employment issues, military health care, military education, and POW/MIA issues. In addition, the subcommittee will be responsible for Morale, Welfare and Recreation issues and programs.

Subcommittee on Readiness: Military readiness, training, logistics and maintenance issues and programs. In addition, the subcommittee will be responsible for all military construction, depot policy, civilian personnel policy, environmental policy, installations and family housing issues, including the base closure process, and energy policy and programs of the Department of Defense.

Subcommittee on Seapower and Projection Forces: Navy acquisition programs, Naval Reserve equipment, and Marine Corps am-

phibious assault vehicle programs (except strategic weapons, space, special operations, science and technology programs, and information technology programs), deep strike bombers and related systems, lift programs, seaborne unmanned aerial systems and the associated weapons systems sustainment. In addition, the subcommittee will be responsible for Maritime programs under the jurisdiction of the Committee as delineated in paragraphs 5 and 9 of clause 1(c) of rule X of the Rules of the House of Representatives.

Subcommittee on Strategic Forces: Strategic weapons (except deep strike bombers and related systems), space programs (including national intelligence space programs), ballistic missile defense, the associated weapons systems sustainment, and Department of Energy national security programs.

Subcommittee on Emerging Threats and Capabilities: Defense-wide and joint enabling activities and programs to include: Special Operations Forces; counter-proliferation and counter-terrorism programs and initiatives; science and technology policy and programs; information technology programs; homeland defense and Department of Defense related consequence management programs; related intelligence support; and other enabling programs and activities to include cyber operations, strategic communications, and information operations; and the Cooperative Threat Reduction program.

Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations: Any matter within the jurisdiction of the Committee, subject to the concurrence of the Chairman of the Committee and, as appropriate, affected subcommittee chairmen. The subcommittee shall have no legislative jurisdiction.

##### (b) Membership of the Subcommittees

(1) Subcommittee memberships, with the exception of membership on the Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations, shall be filled in accordance with the rules of the Majority party's conference and the Minority party's caucus, respectively.

(2) The Chairman and Ranking Minority Member of the Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations shall be filled in accordance with the rules of the Majority party's conference and the Minority party's caucus, respectively. Consistent with the party ratios established by the Majority party, all other Majority members of the subcommittee shall be appointed by the Chairman of the Committee, and all other Minority members shall be appointed by the Ranking Minority Member of the Committee.

(3) The Chairman of the Committee and Ranking Minority Member thereof may sit as ex officio members of all subcommittees. Ex officio members shall not vote in subcommittee hearings or meetings or be taken into consideration for the purpose of determining the ratio of the subcommittees or establishing a quorum at subcommittee hearings or meetings.

(4) A member of the Committee who is not a member of a particular subcommittee may sit with the subcommittee and participate during any of its hearings but shall not have authority to vote, cannot be counted for the purpose of achieving a quorum, and cannot raise a point of order at the hearing.

#### RULE 5. COMMITTEE PANELS AND TASK FORCES

##### (a) Committee Panels

(1) The Chairman may designate a panel of the Committee consisting of members of the Committee to inquire into and take testimony on a matter or matters that fall within the jurisdiction of more than one subcommittee and to report to the Committee.

(2) No panel appointed by the Chairman shall continue in existence for more than six months after the appointment. A panel so

appointed may, upon the expiration of six months, be reappointed by the Chairman for a period of time which is not to exceed six months.

(3) Consistent with the party ratios established by the Majority party, all Majority members of the panels shall be appointed by the Chairman of the Committee, and all Minority members shall be appointed by the Ranking Minority Member of the Committee. The Chairman of the Committee shall choose one of the Majority members so appointed who does not currently chair another subcommittee of the Committee to serve as Chairman of the panel. The Ranking Minority Member of the Committee shall similarly choose the Ranking Minority Member of the panel.

(4) No panel shall have legislative jurisdiction.

(b) Committee and Subcommittee Task Forces

(1) The Chairman of the Committee, or a Chairman of a subcommittee with the concurrence of the Chairman of the Committee, may designate a task force to inquire into and take testimony on a matter that falls within the jurisdiction of the Committee or subcommittee, respectively. The Chairman and Ranking Minority Member of the Committee or subcommittee shall each appoint an equal number of members to the task force. The Chairman of the Committee or subcommittee shall choose one of the members so appointed, who does not currently chair another subcommittee of the Committee, to serve as Chairman of the task force. The Ranking Minority Member of the Committee or subcommittee shall similarly appoint the Ranking Minority Member of the task force.

(2) No task force appointed by the Chairman of the Committee or subcommittee shall continue in existence for more than three months. A task force may only be reappointed for an additional three months with the written concurrence of the Chairman and Ranking Minority Member of the Committee or subcommittee whose Chairman appointed the task force.

(3) No task force shall have legislative jurisdiction.

#### RULE 6. REFERENCE AND CONSIDERATION OF LEGISLATION

(a) The Chairman shall refer legislation and other matters to the appropriate subcommittee or to the full Committee.

(b) Legislation shall be taken up for a hearing or markup only when called by the Chairman of the Committee or subcommittee, as appropriate, or by a majority of the Committee or subcommittee, as appropriate.

(c) The Chairman, with approval of a majority vote of a quorum of the Committee, shall have authority to discharge a subcommittee from consideration of any measure or matter referred thereto and have such measure or matter considered by the Committee.

(d) Reports and recommendations of a subcommittee may not be considered by the Committee until after the intervention of three calendar days from the time the report is approved by the subcommittee and available to the members of the Committee, except that this rule may be waived by a majority vote of a quorum of the Committee.

(e) The Chairman, in consultation with the Ranking Minority Member, shall establish criteria for recommending legislation and other matters to be considered by the House of Representatives, pursuant to clause 1 of rule XV of the Rules of the House of Representatives. Such criteria shall not conflict with the Rules of the House of Representatives and other applicable rules.

#### RULE 7. PUBLIC ANNOUNCEMENT OF HEARINGS AND MEETINGS

(a) Pursuant to clause 2(g)(3) of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the Chairman of the Committee, or of any subcommittee, panel, or task force, shall make a public announcement of the date, place, and subject matter of any hearing or meeting before that body at least one week before the commencement of a hearing and at least three days before the commencement of a meeting. However, if the Chairman of the Committee, or of any subcommittee, panel, or task force, with the concurrence of the respective Ranking Minority Member, determines that there is good cause to begin the hearing or meeting sooner, or if the Committee, subcommittee, panel, or task force so determines by majority vote, a quorum being present for the transaction of business, such chairman shall make the announcement at the earliest possible date. Any announcement made under this rule shall be promptly published in the Daily Digest, promptly entered into the committee scheduling service of the House Information Resources, and promptly made publicly available in electronic form.

(b) At least 24 hours prior to the commencement of a meeting for the markup of legislation, or at the time of an announcement under paragraph (a) made within 24 hours before such meeting, the Chairman of the Committee, or of any subcommittee, panel, or task force shall cause the text of such measure or matter to be made publicly available in electronic form as provided in clause 2(g)(4) of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives.

#### RULE 8. BROADCASTING OF COMMITTEE HEARINGS AND MEETINGS

(a) Pursuant to clause 2(e)(5) of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the Committee shall, to the maximum extent practicable, provide audio and video coverage of each hearing or meeting for the transaction of business in a manner that allows the public to easily listen to and view the proceedings. The Committee shall maintain the recordings of such coverage in a manner that is easily accessible to the public.

(b) Clause 4 of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives shall apply to the Committee.

#### RULE 9. MEETINGS AND HEARINGS OPEN TO THE PUBLIC

(a) Each hearing and meeting for the transaction of business, including the markup of legislation, conducted by the Committee, or any subcommittee, panel, or task force, to the extent that the respective body is authorized to conduct markups, shall be open to the public except when the Committee, subcommittee, panel, or task force in open session and with a majority being present, determines by record vote that all or part of the remainder of that hearing or meeting on that day shall be in executive session because disclosure of testimony, evidence, or other matters to be considered would endanger the national security, would compromise sensitive law enforcement information, or would violate any law or rule of the House of Representatives. Notwithstanding the requirements of the preceding sentence, a majority of those present, there being in attendance no fewer than two members of the Committee, subcommittee, panel, or task force may vote to close a hearing or meeting for the sole purpose of discussing whether testimony or evidence to be received would endanger the national security, would compromise sensitive law enforcement information, or would violate any law or rule of the House of Representatives. If the decision is

to proceed in executive session, the vote must be by record vote and in open session, a majority of the Committee, subcommittee, panel, or task force being present.

(b) Whenever it is asserted by a member of the Committee or subcommittee that the evidence or testimony at a hearing may tend to defame, degrade, or incriminate any person, or it is asserted by a witness that the evidence or testimony that the witness would give at a hearing may tend to defame, degrade, or incriminate the witness, notwithstanding the requirements of (a) and the provisions of clause 2(g)(2) of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives, such evidence or testimony shall be presented in executive session, if by a majority vote of those present, there being in attendance no fewer than two members of the Committee or subcommittee, the Committee or subcommittee determines that such evidence may tend to defame, degrade, or incriminate any person. A majority of those present, there being in attendance no fewer than two members of the Committee or subcommittee may also vote to close the hearing or meeting for the sole purpose of discussing whether evidence or testimony to be received would tend to defame, degrade, or incriminate any person. The Committee or subcommittee shall proceed to receive such testimony in open session only if the Committee or subcommittee, a majority being present, determines that such evidence or testimony will not tend to defame, degrade, or incriminate any person.

(c) Notwithstanding the foregoing, and with the approval of the Chairman, each member of the Committee may designate by letter to the Chairman, one member of that member's personal staff, and an alternate, which may include fellows, with Top Secret security clearance to attend hearings of the Committee, or that member's subcommittee(s), panel(s), or task force(s) (excluding briefings or meetings held under the provisions of committee rule 9(a)), which have been closed under the provisions of rule 9(a) above for national security purposes for the taking of testimony. The attendance of such a staff member or fellow at such hearings is subject to the approval of the Committee, subcommittee, panel, or task force as dictated by national security requirements at that time. The attainment of any required security clearances is the responsibility of individual members of the Committee.

(d) Pursuant to clause 2(g)(2) of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives, no Member, Delegate, or Resident Commissioner may be excluded from nonparticipatory attendance at any hearing of the Committee or a subcommittee, unless the House of Representatives shall by majority vote authorize the Committee or subcommittee, for purposes of a particular series of hearings on a particular article of legislation or on a particular subject of investigation, to close its hearings to Members, Delegates, and the Resident Commissioner by the same procedures designated in this rule for closing hearings to the public.

(e) The Committee or the subcommittee may vote, by the same procedure, to meet in executive session for up to five additional consecutive days of hearings.

#### RULE 10. QUORUM

(a) For purposes of taking testimony and receiving evidence, two members shall constitute a quorum.

(b) One-third of the members of the Committee or subcommittee shall constitute a quorum for taking any action, with the following exceptions, in which case a majority of the Committee or subcommittee shall constitute a quorum:

(1) Reporting a measure or recommendation;

(2) Closing Committee or subcommittee meetings and hearings to the public;

(3) Authorizing the issuance of subpoenas;

(4) Authorizing the use of executive session material; and

(5) Voting to proceed in open session after voting to close to discuss whether evidence or testimony to be received would tend to defame, degrade, or incriminate any person.

(c) No measure or recommendation shall be reported to the House of Representatives unless a majority of the Committee is actually present.

#### RULE 11. THE FIVE-MINUTE RULE

(a) Subject to rule 15, the time any one member may address the Committee or subcommittee on any measure or matter under consideration shall not exceed five minutes and then only when the member has been recognized by the Chairman or subcommittee chairman, as appropriate, except that this time limit may be exceeded by unanimous consent. Any member, upon request, shall be recognized for not more than five minutes to address the Committee or subcommittee on behalf of an amendment which the member has offered to any pending bill or resolution. The five-minute limitation shall not apply to the Chairman and Ranking Minority Member of the Committee or subcommittee.

(b)(1) Members who are present at a hearing of the Committee or subcommittee when a hearing is originally convened shall be recognized by the Chairman or subcommittee chairman, as appropriate, in order of seniority. Those members arriving subsequently shall be recognized in order of their arrival. Notwithstanding the foregoing, the Chairman and the Ranking Minority Member will take precedence upon their arrival. In recognizing members to question witnesses in this fashion, the Chairman shall take into consideration the ratio of the Majority to Minority members present and shall establish the order of recognition for questioning in such a manner as not to disadvantage the members of either party.

(2) Pursuant to rule 4 and subject to rule 15, a member of the Committee who is not a member of a subcommittee may be recognized by a subcommittee chairman in order of their arrival and after all present subcommittee members have been recognized.

(3) The Chairman of the Committee or a subcommittee, with the concurrence of the respective Ranking Minority Member, may depart with the regular order for questioning which is specified in paragraphs (a) and (b) of this rule provided that such a decision is announced prior to the hearing or prior to the opening statements of the witnesses and that any such departure applies equally to the Majority and the Minority.

(c) No person other than a Member, Delegate, or Resident Commissioner of Congress and committee staff may be seated in or behind the dais area during Committee, subcommittee, panel, or task force hearings and meetings.

#### RULE 12. POWER TO SIT AND ACT; SUBPOENA POWER

(a) For the purpose of carrying out any of its functions and duties under rules X and XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the Committee and any subcommittee is authorized (subject to subparagraph (b)(1) of this paragraph):

(1) to sit and act at such times and places within the United States, whether the House is in session, has recessed, or has adjourned, and to hold hearings, and

(2) to require by subpoena, or otherwise, the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books,

records, correspondence, memorandums, papers and documents, including, but not limited to, those in electronic form, as it considers necessary.

(b)(1) A subpoena may be authorized and issued by the Committee, or any subcommittee with the concurrence of the full Committee Chairman and after consultation with the Ranking Minority Member of the Committee, under subparagraph (a)(2) in the conduct of any investigation, or series of investigations or activities, only when authorized by a majority of the members voting, a majority of the Committee or subcommittee being present. Authorized subpoenas shall be signed only by the Chairman, or by any member designated by the Committee.

(2) Pursuant to clause 2(m) of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives, compliance with any subpoena issued by the Committee or any subcommittee under subparagraph (a)(2) may be enforced only as authorized or directed by the House of Representatives.

#### RULE 13. WITNESS STATEMENTS

(a) Any prepared statement to be presented by a witness to the Committee or a subcommittee shall be submitted to the Committee or subcommittee at least 48 hours in advance of presentation and shall be distributed to all members of the Committee or subcommittee as soon as practicable but not less than 24 hours in advance of presentation. A copy of any such prepared statement shall also be submitted to the Committee in electronic form. If a prepared statement contains national security information bearing a classification of Confidential or higher, the statement shall be made available in the Committee rooms to all members of the Committee or subcommittee as soon as practicable but not less than 24 hours in advance of presentation; however, no such statement shall be removed from the Committee offices. The requirement of this rule may be waived by a majority vote of the Committee or subcommittee, a quorum being present. In cases where a witness does not submit a statement by the time required under this rule, the Chairman of the Committee or subcommittee, as appropriate, with the concurrence of the respective Ranking Minority Member, may elect to exclude the witness from the hearing.

(b) The Committee and each subcommittee shall require each witness who is to appear before it to file with the Committee in advance of his or her appearance a written statement of the proposed testimony and to limit the oral presentation at such appearance to a brief summary of the submitted written statement.

(c) Pursuant to clause 2(g)(5) of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives, written witness statements, with appropriate redactions to protect the privacy of the witness, shall be made publicly available in electronic form not later than one day after the witness appears.

#### RULE 14. ADMINISTERING OATHS TO WITNESSES

(a) The Chairman, or any member designated by the Chairman, may administer oaths to any witness.

(b) Witnesses, when sworn, shall subscribe to the following oath:

“Do you solemnly swear (or affirm) that the testimony you will give before this Committee (or subcommittee) in the matters now under consideration will be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?”

#### RULE 15. QUESTIONING OF WITNESSES

(a) When a witness is before the Committee or a subcommittee, members of the Committee or subcommittee may put questions to the witness only when recognized by the

Chairman or subcommittee chairman, as appropriate, for that purpose according to rule 11 of the Committee.

(b) Members of the Committee or subcommittee who so desire shall have not more than five minutes to question each witness or panel of witnesses, the responses of the witness or witnesses being included in the five-minute period, until such time as each member has had an opportunity to question each witness or panel of witnesses. Thereafter, additional rounds for questioning witnesses by members are within the discretion of the Chairman or subcommittee chairman, as appropriate.

(c) Questions put to witnesses before the Committee or subcommittee shall be pertinent to the measure or matter that may be before the Committee or subcommittee for consideration.

#### RULE 16. PUBLICATION OF COMMITTEE HEARINGS AND MARKUPS

The transcripts of those hearings conducted by the Committee, subcommittee, or panel will be published officially in substantially verbatim form, with the material requested for the record inserted at that place requested, or at the end of the record, as appropriate. The transcripts of markups conducted by the Committee or any subcommittee may be published officially in verbatim form. Any requests to correct any errors, other than those in transcription, will be appended to the record, and the appropriate place where the change is requested will be footnoted. Any transcript published under this rule shall include the results of record votes conducted in the session covered by the transcript and shall also include materials that have been submitted for the record and are covered under rule 19. The handling and safekeeping of these materials shall fully satisfy the requirements of rule 20. No transcript of an executive session conducted under rule 9 shall be published under this rule.

#### RULE 17. VOTING AND ROLLCALLS

(a) Voting on a measure or matter may be by record vote, division vote, voice vote, or unanimous consent.

(b) A record vote shall be ordered upon the request of one-fifth of those members present.

(c) No vote by any member of the Committee or a subcommittee with respect to any measure or matter shall be cast by proxy.

(d) In the event of a vote or votes, when a member is in attendance at any other committee, subcommittee, or conference committee meeting during that time, the necessary absence of that member shall be so noted in the record vote record, upon timely notification to the Chairman by that member.

(e) The Chairman of the Committee or a subcommittee, as appropriate, with the concurrence of the Ranking Minority Member or the most senior Minority member who is present at the time, may elect to postpone requested record votes until such time or point at a markup as is mutually decided. When proceedings resume on a postponed question, notwithstanding any intervening order for the previous question, the underlying proposition shall remain subject to further debate or amendment to the same extent as when the question was postponed.

#### RULE 18. COMMITTEE REPORTS

(a) If, at the time of approval of any measure or matter by the Committee, any member of the Committee gives timely notice of intention to file supplemental, Minority, additional or dissenting views, all members shall be entitled to not less than two calendar days (excluding Saturdays, Sundays,

and legal holidays except when the House is in session on such days) in which to file such written and signed views with the Staff Director of the Committee, or the Staff Director's designee. All such views so filed by one or more members of the Committee shall be included within, and shall be a part of, the report filed by the Committee with respect to that measure or matter.

(b) With respect to each record vote on a motion to report any measure or matter, and on any amendment offered to the measure or matter, the total number of votes cast for and against, the names of those voting for and against, and a brief description of the question, shall be included in the Committee report on the measure or matter.

(c) Not later than 24 hours after the adoption of any amendment to a measure or matter considered by the Committee, the Chairman shall cause the text of each such amendment to be made publicly available in electronic form as provided in clause 2(e)(6) of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives.

#### RULE 19. PUBLIC INSPECTION OF COMMITTEE ROLLCALLS

The result of each record vote in any meeting of the Committee shall be made available by the Committee for inspection by the public at reasonable times in the offices of the Committee and also made publicly available in electronic form within 48 hours of such record vote pursuant to clause 2(e)(1)(B)(i) of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives. Information so available shall include a description of the amendment, motion, order, or other proposition and the name of each member voting for and each member voting against such amendment,

motion, order, or proposition and the names of those members present but not voting.

#### RULE 20. PROTECTION OF NATIONAL SECURITY AND OTHER INFORMATION

(a) Except as provided in clause 2(g) of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives, all national security information bearing a classification of Confidential or higher which has been received by the Committee or a subcommittee shall be deemed to have been received in executive session and shall be given appropriate safekeeping.

(b) The Chairman of the Committee shall, with the approval of a majority of the Committee, establish such procedures as in his judgment may be necessary to prevent the unauthorized disclosure of any national security information that is received which is classified as Confidential or higher. Such procedures shall, however, ensure access to this information by any member of the Committee or any other Member, Delegate, or Resident Commissioner of the House of Representatives, staff of the Committee, or staff designated under rule 9(c) who have the appropriate security clearances and the need to know, who has requested the opportunity to review such material.

(c) The Chairman of the Committee shall, in consultation with the Ranking Minority Member, establish such procedures as in his judgment may be necessary to prevent the unauthorized disclosure of any proprietary information that is received by the Committee, subcommittee, panel, or task force. Such procedures shall be consistent with the Rules of the House of Representatives and applicable law.

#### RULE 21. COMMITTEE STAFFING

The staffing of the Committee, the standing subcommittees, and any panel or task

force designated by the Chairman or chairmen of the subcommittees shall be subject to the Rules of the House of Representatives.

#### RULE 22. COMMITTEE RECORDS

The records of the Committee at the National Archives and Records Administration shall be made available for public use in accordance with rule VII of the Rules of the House of Representatives. The Chairman shall notify the Ranking Minority Member of any decision, pursuant to clause 3(b)(3) or clause 4(b) of rule VII, to withhold a record otherwise available, and the matter shall be presented to the Committee for a determination on the written request of any member of the Committee.

#### RULE 23. HEARING PROCEDURES

Clause 2(k) of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives shall apply to the Committee.

#### RULE 24. COMMITTEE ACTIVITY REPORTS

Not later than January 2nd of each odd-numbered year the Committee shall submit to the House a report on its activities, pursuant to clause 1(d) of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives.

### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. FORTENBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 9 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Tuesday, January 17, 2017, at noon.

### EXPENDITURE REPORTS CONCERNING OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL

Reports concerning the foreign currencies and U.S. dollars utilized for Official Foreign Travel during the fourth quarter of 2016, pursuant to Public Law 95-384, are as follows:

#### REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, DELEGATION TO FRANCE AND THE UNITED KINGDOM, EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT. 23 AND OCT. 28, 2016

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem <sup>1</sup>		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>
Hugh N. Halpern .....	10/24	10/25	France .....		345.00		* 2,443.46				2,788.46
Karen L. Haas .....	10/24	10/25	France .....		345.00		* 2,443.46				2,788.46
Thomas Wickham .....	10/24	10/25	France .....		345.00		* 2,443.46				2,788.46
Nicole Foltz .....	10/24	10/25	France .....		345.00		* 2,443.46				2,788.46
Shuwanza Goff .....	10/24	10/25	France .....		345.00		* 2,443.46				2,788.46
Stephen Cote .....	10/24	10/25	France .....		313.00		* 2,443.46				2,756.46
Don Sisson .....	10/24	10/25	France .....		313.00		* 2,443.46				2,756.46
Hugh N. Halpern .....	10/25	10/28	U.K. ....		1,319.78						1,319.78
Karen L. Haas .....	10/25	10/28	U.K. ....		1,319.78						1,319.78
Thomas Wickham .....	10/25	10/28	U.K. ....		1,319.78						1,319.78
Nicole Foltz .....	10/25	10/28	U.K. ....		1,319.78						1,319.78
Shuwanza Goff .....	10/25	10/28	U.K. ....		1,319.77						1,319.77
Stephen Cote .....	10/25	10/28	U.K. ....		1,319.77						1,319.77
Don Sisson .....	10/25	10/28	U.K. ....		1,319.77						1,319.77
Committee total .....					11,589.43		17,104.22				28,693.65

<sup>1</sup> Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

<sup>2</sup> If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

\* Airfare all-inclusive.

HUGH N. HALPERN, Jan. 6, 2017.

#### REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT. 1 AND DEC. 31, 2016

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem <sup>1</sup>		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>

#### HOUSE COMMITTEES

Please Note: If there were no expenditures during the calendar quarter noted above, please check the box at the right to so indicate and return. ☐

<sup>1</sup> Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

<sup>2</sup> If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

HON. DIANE BLACK, Jan. 6, 2017.

## REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON ETHICS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT. 1 AND DEC. 31, 2016

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem <sup>1</sup>		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>

## HOUSE COMMITTEES

Please Note: If there were no expenditures during the calendar quarter noted above, please check the box at right to so indicate and return. ☐<sup>1</sup> Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.<sup>2</sup> If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

HON. CHARLES W. DENT, Chairman, Jan. 4, 2017.

## REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON HOUSE ADMINISTRATION, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT. 1 AND DEC. 31, 2016

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem <sup>1</sup>		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>

## HOUSE COMMITTEES

Please Note: If there were no expenditures during the calendar quarter noted above, please check the box at right to so indicate and return. ☐<sup>1</sup> Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.<sup>2</sup> If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

HON. CANDICE S. MILLER, Dec. 29, 2016.

## REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON NATURAL RESOURCES, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT. 1 AND DEC. 31, 2016

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem <sup>1</sup>		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>
Terry Camp .....	9/22	10/6	South Africa .....		4,566.81		1,937.06				6,503.87
Matthew Strickler .....	9/30	10/6	South Africa .....		1,392.47		2,353.56				3,746.03
Hon. Sablan .....	10/15	10/22	Micronesia .....		827.89		1,267.20				2,095.09
Marc Alberts .....	10/15	10/22	Micronesia .....		827.89		3,068.76				3,896.65
Brian Modeste .....	10/15	10/22	Micronesia .....		827.89		13,978.56				14,806.45
Kate MacGregor .....	10/31	11/6	Norway/Germany .....		1,652.48		5,186.76				6,839.24
Steven Feldgus .....	10/31	11/6	Norway/Germany .....		1,652.48		5,186.76				6,839.24
Michael Freeman .....	10/31	11/6	Norway/Germany .....		1,652.48		5,186.76				6,839.24
Matthew Schafle .....	10/31	11/6	Norway/Germany .....		1,652.48		5,186.76				6,839.24
Molly Block .....	10/31	11/6	Norway/Germany .....		1,652.48		5,186.76				6,839.24
Sang Yi .....	10/31	11/6	Norway/Germany .....		1,652.48		5,186.76				6,839.24
Committee total .....					18,357.83		53,725.70				72,083.53

<sup>1</sup> Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.<sup>2</sup> If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

HON. ROB BISHOP, Chairman, Jan. 4, 2017.

## REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, JOINT COMMITTEE ON TAXATION, EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT. 1 AND DEC. 31, 2016

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem <sup>1</sup>		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>

## HOUSE COMMITTEES

Please Note: If there were no expenditures during the calendar quarter noted above, please check the box at right to so indicate and return. ☐<sup>1</sup> Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.<sup>2</sup> If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

SENATOR ORRIN G. HATCH, Chairman, Jan. 6, 2017.

## EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

180. A letter from the PRAO Branch Chief, Food and Nutrition Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's Major final rule and interim final rule — Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP): Eligibility, Certification, and Employment and Training Provisions of the Food, Conservation and Energy Act of 2008 [FNS 2011-0008] (RIN: 0584-AD87) received January 11, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Agriculture.

181. A letter from the Supervisory Regulatory Analyst, Grain Inspection, Packers and Stockyards Administration, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Fees for Official Inspection and Official Weighing Services Under the United States Grain Standards Act (USGSA) received January 11, 2017, pursuant

to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Agriculture.

182. A letter from the Deputy Chief, Disability Rights Office, Consumer and Governmental Affairs Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Transition from TTY to Real-Time Text Technology [CG Docket No.: 16-145]; Petition for Rulemaking to Update the Commission's Rules for Access to Support the Transition from TTY to Real-Time Text Technology, and Petition for Waiver of Rules Requiring Support of TTY Technology [GN Docket No.: 15-178] received January 12, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

183. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for Legislation, Regulation and Energy Efficiency, Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy, Department of Energy, transmitting the Department's Major direct final rule — Energy Conservation Program: Energy Conservation Standards for

Residential Central Air Conditioners and Heat Pumps [Docket No.: EERE-2014-BT-STD-0048] (RIN: 1904-AD37) received January 11, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

184. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for Legislation, Regulation and Energy Efficiency, Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy, Department of Energy, transmitting the Department's final rule — Energy Efficiency Standards for the Design and Construction of New Federal Low-Rise Residential Buildings' Baseline Standards Update [Docket No.: EERE-2016-BT-STD-0003] (RIN: 1904-AD56) received January 11, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

185. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting an Executive Order revoking section 1 and 2 of Executive Order 13067 of November 3, 1997, and revoking Executive Order 13412 of October 13, 2006, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 1703(b); Public

Law 95-223 Sec. 204(b); (91 Stat. 1627) (H. Doc. No. 115-6); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed.

186. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Export Administration, Bureau of Industry and Security, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Department's final rule — Implementation of the February 2016 Australia Group (AG) Intersectoral Decisions and the June 2016 AG Plenary Understandings [Docket No.: 160922876-6876-01] (RIN: 0694-AH14) received January 11, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

187. A letter from the Assistant Director for Regulatory Affairs, Office of Foreign Assets Control, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the Department's final rule — Sudanese Sanctions Regulations received January 12, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

188. A letter from the Senior Procurement Executive, Office of Acquisition Policy, General Services Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Federal Acquisition Regulation; Prohibition on Reimbursement for Congressional Investigations and Inquiries [FAC 2005-95; FAR Case 2015-016; Item V; Docket No.: 2015-0016; Sequence No.: 1] (RIN: 9000-AM97) received January 11, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

189. A letter from the Senior Procurement Executive, Office of Acquisition Policy, General Services Administration, transmitting the Administration's small entity compliance guide — Federal Acquisition Regulation; Federal Acquisition Circular 2005-95 [Docket No.: FAR 2016-0051, Sequence No.: 9] received January 11, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

190. A letter from the Senior Procurement Executive, Office of Acquisition Policy, General Services Administration, transmitting the Administration's summary presentation of final rules — Federal Acquisition Regulation; Federal Acquisition Circular 2005-95; Introduction [Docket No.: FAR 2016-0051, Sequence No.: 9] received January 11, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

191. A letter from the Senior Procurement Executive, Office of Acquisition Policy, General Services Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Federal Acquisition Regulation; Uniform Use of Line Items [FAC 2005-95; FAR Case 2013-014; Item I; Docket No.: 2013-0014, Sequence No.: 1] (RIN: 9000-AM73) received January 11, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

192. A letter from the Senior Procurement Executive, Office of Acquisition Policy, General Services Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Federal Acquisition Regulation; Acquisition Threshold for Special Emergency Procurement Authority [FAC 2005-95; FAR Case 2016-004; Item II; Docket No.: 2016-0004, Sequence No.: 1] (RIN: 9000-AN18) received January 11, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

193. A letter from the Senior Procurement Executive, Office of Acquisition Policy, General Services Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Federal

Acquisition Regulation; Contractor Employee Internal Confidentiality Agreements or Statements [FAC 2005-95; FAR Case 2015-012; Item III; Docket No.: 2015-0012, Sequence No.: 1] (RIN: 9000-AN04) received January 11, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

194. A letter from the Senior Procurement Executive, Office of Acquisition Policy, General Services Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Federal Acquisition Regulation; Contracts Under the Small Business Administration 8(a) Program [FAC 2005-95; FAR Case 2012-022; Item IV; Docket No.: 2012-0022, Sequence No.: 1] (RIN: 9000-AM68) received January 11, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

195. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Personnel Management, transmitting the Office's interim rule — Veterans' Preference [RIN: 3206-AN47] received January 12, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

196. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator For Regulatory Programs, NMFS, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Management Area; American Fisheries Act; Amendment 113 [Docket No.: 151113999-6999-02] (RIN: 0648-BF54) received January 11, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

197. A letter from the Acting Chief, Branch of Conservation and Communications, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Revisions to the Regulations for Candidate Conservation Agreements With Assurances [Docket No.: FWS-HQ-ES-2015-0171; FF09E40000 167 FXES11150900000] (RIN: 1018-BB25) received January 11, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

198. A letter from the Chief, Division of Policy, Performance, and Management Programs, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Refuge-Specific Regulations; Public Use; Kenai National Wildlife Refuge [Docket No.: FWS-R7-NWRS-2014-0003; FF07RKNA00 FXRS12610700000 167] (RIN: 1018-AX56) received January 11, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

199. A letter from the Chief, Division of Policy, Performance, and Management Programs, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Identification of 14 Distinct Population Segments of the Humpback Whale and Revision of Species-Wide Listing [Docket No.: FWS-HQ-ES-2016-0126; FXES11130900000 167 FF09E42000] (RIN: 1018-BB80) received January 11, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

200. A letter from the Chief, Division of Policy, Performance, and Management Programs, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Subsistence Management Regulations for Public Lands in

Alaska—2016-17 and 2017-18 Subsistence Taking of Wildlife Regulations [Docket No.: FWS-R7-SM-2014-0062; FXFR13350700640-167-FF07J00000 FBMS #4500094243] (RIN: 1018-BA39) received January 11, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

201. A letter from the Attorney, Legal Division, Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection, transmitting the Bureau's final rule — Civil Penalty Inflation Adjustments received January 13, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

202. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Attorney General, Civil Rights Division, Department of Justice, transmitting the Department's final rule — Nondiscrimination on the Basis of Disability by Public Accommodations — Movie Theaters; Movie Captioning and Audio Description [CRT Docket No.: 126; AG Order No.: 3779-2016] (RIN: 1190-AA63) received January 12, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

203. A letter from the Regulatory Affairs Specialist, Bureau of Ocean Energy Management, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Oil and Gas and Sulphur Operations in the Outer Continental Shelf-Civil Penalties Inflation Adjustments [Docket ID: BOEM-2016-0055] (RIN: 1010-AD95) received January 12, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

204. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Federal Maritime Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Inflation Adjustment of Civil Monetary Penalties [Docket No.: 17-01] (RIN: 3072-AC67) received January 11, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

205. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, Bureau of the Fiscal Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the Department's final rule — Regulations Governing Retirement Savings Bonds (RIN: 1530-AA13) received January 12, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

206. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's IRB only rule — Maximum Vehicle Values for 2017 for Use With Vehicle Cents-Per-Mile and Fleet-Average Valuation Rules [Notice 2017-03] received January 11, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

207. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's IRB only rule — Guidance Relating to the Availability and Use of an Account Transcript as a Substitute for an Estate Tax Closing Letter [Notice 2017-12] received January 11, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

## PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey (for himself, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mrs. BLACK, Ms. FOXX, Mrs. WAGNER, Mrs. BLACKBURN,



Mrs. NOEM, Ms. CHENEY, Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia, Mr. HULTGREN, Mr. HUIZENGA, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. KELLY of Mississippi, Mr. ROTHFUS, Mr. PITTENGER, Mr. ROSKAM, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. GIBBS, Mr. MOOLENAAR, Mr. BANKS of Indiana, Mr. COLLINS of New York, Mr. DUFFY, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. MULLIN, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia, Mr. OLSON, Mr. LATTA, Mr. ROKITA, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. LAHOOD, Mr. WENSTRUP, Mr. JONES, Mr. STEWART, Mr. FLORES, Mr. SCALISE, Mr. EMMER, Mr. YODER, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. BABIN, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. MASSIE, and Mr. AMASH):

H.R. 7. A bill to prohibit taxpayer funded abortions; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, and the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. CALVERT (for himself, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. ROHRBACHER, Mr. LAMALFA, and Mr. COOK):

H.R. 514. A bill to deny Federal funding to any State or political subdivision of a State that has in effect any law, policy, or procedure that prevents or impedes a State or local law enforcement official from maintaining custody of an alien pursuant to an immigration detainer issued by the Secretary of Homeland Security, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ELLISON:

H.R. 515. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development to provide grants and loans to owners of dated manufactured homes for the replacement of such dated manufactured homes with Energy Star-qualified manufactured or modular homes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. ELLISON:

H.R. 516. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to reduce the mortgage interest deduction relating to acquisition indebtedness for certain taxpayers; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ELLISON:

H.R. 517. A bill to amend the Real Estate Settlement Procedures Act of 1974 to prohibit certain financial benefits for referrals of business and to improve the judicial relief for certain violations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Ms. DEGETTE (for herself, Mr. GUTHRIE, Ms. MATSUI, and Mr. DENT):

H.R. 518. A bill to amend the Energy Policy and Conservation Act to exclude power supply circuits, drivers, and devices designed to be connected to, and power, light-emitting diodes or organic light-emitting diodes providing illumination from energy conservation standards for external power supplies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. BUCK (for himself, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. TIPTON, Mrs. LOVE, and Mr. BISHOP of Utah):

H.R. 519. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to facilitate water leasing and water transfers to promote conservation and efficiency; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. AMODEI:

H.R. 520. A bill to require the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture to more efficiently develop domestic sources of the minerals and mineral materials of

strategic and critical importance to the economic and national security and manufacturing competitiveness of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. AMODEI (for himself, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. PITTENGER, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, and Mr. HUIZENGA):

H.R. 521. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide an exemption to the individual mandate to maintain health coverage for individuals residing in counties with fewer than 2 health insurance issuers offering plans on an Exchange; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GOODLATTE (for himself, Mr. PETERSON, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. ISSA, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. JORDAN, Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. CHAFFETZ, Mr. MARINO, Mr. GOWDY, Mr. LABRADOR, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, Mr. DESANTIS, Mrs. MIMI WALTERS of California, Mr. BUCK, Mr. RATCLIFFE, Mr. TROTT, Mr. BISHOP of Michigan, Mrs. ROBY, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. BIGGS, and Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana):

H.R. 522. A bill to limit donations made pursuant to settlement agreements to which the United States is a party, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MARCHANT:

H.R. 523. A bill to provide further means of accountability of the United States debt and promote fiscal responsibility; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LAMBORN (for himself, Mr. WENSTRUP, Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia, and Mr. JONES):

H.R. 524. A bill to prohibit any person from soliciting or knowingly acquiring, receiving, or accepting a donation of human fetal tissue for any purpose other than disposal of the tissue if the donation affects interstate commerce and the tissue will be or is obtained pursuant to an induced abortion, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. CRAWFORD (for himself, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. ABRAHAM, Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. COMER, Ms. LEE, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. MOULTON, Mr. EMMER, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. HARPER, Mr. WESTERMAN, Mr. ROKITA, Mr. MARSHALL, Mr. SMITH of Missouri, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. PALAZZO, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. BANKS of Indiana, Mrs. BUSTOS, Mr. BEYER, and Mr. JONES):

H.R. 525. A bill to modify the prohibition on United States assistance and financing for certain exports to Cuba under the Trade Sanctions Reform and Export Enhancement Act of 2000, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committees on Financial Services, and Agriculture, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. KATKO (for himself, Mr. HURD, Mr. DONOVAN, Mr. VELA, Mr. KEATING, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. PAYNE, Ms. MCSALLY, and Mr. RATCLIFFE):

H.R. 526. A bill to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to establish in the Department of Homeland Security a board to coordinate and integrate departmental intelligence, activities, and policy related to counterterrorism, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

By Mr. BISHOP of Utah (for himself, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. AMODEI, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. STEWART, Mrs. LOVE, Mr. LABRADOR, Mr. CHAFFETZ, Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS, Mr. TIPTON, and Ms. CHENEY):

H.R. 527. A bill to provide for the conservation and preservation of the Greater Sage Grouse by facilitating State recovery plans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania (for himself, Mr. JONES, and Mr. NOLAN):

H.R. 528. A bill to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to prohibit individuals holding Federal office from directly soliciting contributions to or on behalf of any political committee under such Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Ms. JENKINS of Kansas (for herself and Mr. KIND):

H.R. 529. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to make improvements in the rules related to qualified tuition programs and qualified ABLE programs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ENGEL (for himself, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. SOTO, Mr. KEATING, Mr. SIREN, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Ms. NORTON, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mr. DESAULNIER, Mr. CICILLINE, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Ms. SHEAPORTER, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Ms. TITUS, Mr. BERA, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. WELCH, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. SCHNEIDER, Mr. CROWLEY, Ms. MENG, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. MEEKS, Ms. PLASKETT, Mr. CUMMINGS, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, Mr. CLAY, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. DELANEY, Mr. RUSH, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Ms. GABBARD, Mrs. TORRES, Ms. PINGREE, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. HIGGINS of New York, Mr. COURTNEY, Ms. BASS, Mr. SUOZZI, Mr. NADLER, Mr. CRIST, Ms. ESTY, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. MOULTON, Mr. SCHIFF, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. COHEN, Mrs. BUSTOS, Mr. KIND, Mr. QUIGLEY, and Ms. VELÁZQUEZ):

H.R. 530. A bill to expose and deter unlawful and subversive foreign interference in elections for Federal office, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committees on the Judiciary, and Financial Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. HILL (for himself and Mr. SCHWEIKERT):

H.R. 531. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to make an exception to the 100 shareholder S corporation limitation in the case of shareholders whose shares were acquired through certain crowd-funding or small public offerings; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. O'ROURKE (for himself, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Ms. BARRAGÁN, Mr. CORREA, Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. BROWN of Maryland, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. POLIS, Ms. MENG, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. HANABUSA, Mr. KIHUEN,

Mr. TED LIEU of California, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. TONKO, Mrs. TORRES, Mr. VARGAS, Ms. TITUS, and Ms. SLAUGHTER):

H.R. 532. A bill to provide for the protection of information submitted to the Department of Homeland Security pursuant to the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EMMER (for himself and Mrs. LOVE):

H.R. 533. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to lower the corporate rate of income tax to the OECD average, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. EMMER (for himself, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. NOLAN, Mr. PETERSON, Mr. PAULSEN, Mr. LEWIS of Minnesota, Mr. WALZ, and Mr. WEBER of Texas):

H.R. 534. A bill to require the Secretary of State to take such actions as may be necessary for the United States to rejoin the Bureau of International Expositions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CHABOT (for himself, Mr. ROYCE of California, and Mr. SHERMAN):

H.R. 535. A bill to encourage visits between the United States and Taiwan at all levels, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BIGGS:

H.R. 536. A bill to provide that the salaries of Members of a House of Congress will be held in escrow if that House has not agreed to a concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2018 by April 15, 2017 and to withhold the salary of the Director of OMB upon failure to submit the President's budget to Congress as required by section 1105 of title 31, United States Code; to the Committee on House Administration, and in addition to the Committees on the Budget, and Oversight and Government Reform, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BIGGS:

H.R. 537. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide an exemption to the individual mandate to maintain health coverage for individuals residing in counties with fewer than 2 health insurance issuers offering plans on an Exchange; to require members of Congress and congressional staff to abide by the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act with respect to health insurance coverage; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committees on Energy and Commerce, House Administration, and Oversight and Government Reform, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BISHOP of Georgia (for himself and Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia):

H.R. 538. A bill to redesignate Ocmulgee National Monument in the State of Georgia and revise its boundary, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mrs. BLACKBURN (for herself and Mr. RUSH):

H.R. 539. A bill to amend title IX of the Public Health Service Act to revise the operations of the United States Preventive Services Task Force, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for

consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. CICILLINE (for himself, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. BEYER, Ms. TITUS, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. DEFazio, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. NADLER, Mr. EVANS, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. GARAMENDI, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. COHEN, and Ms. LOFGREN):

H.R. 540. A bill to require the disclosure of the Federal income tax returns of the President; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. COLLINS of New York (for himself, Mr. MULLIN, Mr. GUTHRIE, Mr. BUCSHON, and Mr. FLORES):

H.R. 541. A bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to improve the calculation, oversight, and accountability of non-DSH supplemental payments under the Medicaid program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. COLLINS of New York (for himself, Mr. MULLIN, Mr. GUTHRIE, Mr. BUCSHON, and Mr. FLORES):

H.R. 542. A bill to amend title XI of the Social Security Act to require the Secretary of Health and Human Services to follow rule-making procedures for costly Medicaid sub-regulatory policies; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. COLLINS of New York (for himself, Mr. MULLIN, Mr. GUTHRIE, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. BUCSHON, and Mr. FLORES):

H.R. 543. A bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act for purposes of prioritizing the most vulnerable Medicaid patients; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. COOK (for himself, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Ms. JENKINS of Kansas, Mr. POLIQUIN, and Mr. DUNN):

H.R. 544. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to provide for penalties for the sale of any Purple Heart awarded to a member of the Armed Forces; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CRAMER (for himself, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. PETERSON, and Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia):

H.R. 545. A bill to establish the United States Commission on the Organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. CULBERSON (for himself, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. WEBER of Texas, and Mr. BARLETTA):

H.R. 546. A bill to amend section 412(a)(2) of the Immigration and Nationality Act to require the Director of the Office of Refugee Resettlement to obtain the approval of the Governor of a State before placing or resettling a refugee with the State, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. DELAURO (for herself, Mr. TAKANO, Ms. KAPTUR, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. DEUTCH, Ms. DELBENE, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Ms. PINGREE, Ms.

SPEIER, Ms. MOORE, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. SERRANO, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. TONKO, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. WELCH, Mr. GARAMENDI, Ms. NORTON, Ms. BONAMICI, Ms. BORDALLO, Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. VEASEY, Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. KEATING, Ms. SÁNCHEZ, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Mr. FOSTER, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. POCAN, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. HECK, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Ms. MENG, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. HIMES, Mr. CONYERS, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Ms. ESTY, Mr. DESAULNIER, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. KILMER, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Ms. LEE, Mr. COHEN, Ms. ESHOO, Ms. CLARKE of New York, and Mr. BLUMENAUER):

H.R. 547. A bill to facilitate efficient investments and financing of infrastructure projects and new job creation through the establishment of a National Infrastructure Development Bank, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Transportation and Infrastructure, Financial Services, and Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. DENT (for himself, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. JOYCE of Ohio, Mr. GOSAR, and Mr. HARPER):

H.R. 548. A bill to improve access to emergency medical services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. DONOVAN (for himself, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. KATKO, Miss RICE of New York, Mr. PAYNE, and Mr. MCCAUL):

H.R. 549. A bill to amend the Implementing Recommendations of the 9/11 Commission Act of 2007 to clarify certain allowable uses of funds for public transportation security assistance grants and establish periods of performance for such grants, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

By Mr. ENGEL (for himself, Mr. DONOVAN, Mr. ZELDIN, Ms. SINEMA, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Ms. MENG, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. KING of New York, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, and Mr. PASCRELL):

H.R. 550. A bill to amend title 49, United States Code, to require the deployment of law enforcement personnel at airport screening locations at very large airports, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

By Mr. FORTENBERRY:

H.R. 551. A bill to amend the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act to permit insurers to offer catastrophic coverage plans to anyone, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. FORTENBERRY:

H.R. 552. A bill to prohibit implementation of the revised definition of short-term, limited duration insurance in order to permit such insurance to provide up to 12 months of coverage; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Education and the Workforce, and

Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia:

H.R. 553. A bill to redesignate Gravelly Point Park, located along the George Washington Memorial Parkway in Arlington County, Virginia, as the Nancy Reagan Memorial Park, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. KILDEE:

H.R. 554. A bill to suspend the authority of a State to administer funds under Federal block grant programs if the State does not enact certain conflict of interest protections, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Education and the Workforce, Financial Services, Homeland Security, the Judiciary, Transportation and Infrastructure, and Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. KINZINGER (for himself, Mr. COURTNEY, and Mr. WALDEN):

H.R. 555. A bill to direct the Federal Communications Commission to amend its rules so as to prohibit the application to amateur stations of certain private land use restrictions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. LANCE (for himself and Mr. PASCRELL):

H.R. 556. A bill to require the Administrator of the Federal Highway Administration to make an exception to the Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices to allow for certain colored markings between longitudinal parallel lines for celebratory or ceremonial purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. LATTA:

H.R. 557. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to reform the Federal Communications Commission by requiring an analysis of benefits and costs during the rule making process and creating certain presumptions regarding regulatory forbearance and biennial regulatory review determinations; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. LOUDERMILK (for himself, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. WOODALL, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. CARTER of Georgia, Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia, and Mr. ALLEN):

H.R. 558. A bill to adjust the boundary of the Kennesaw Mountain National Battlefield Park to include the Wallis House and Harriston Hill, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. LOUDERMILK (for himself, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. GROTHMAN, Mr. BARR, Mr. MESSER, Mr. BABIN, Mr. ARRINGTON, and Mr. BISHOP of Michigan):

H.R. 559. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to provide for an alternative removal for performance or misconduct for Federal employees; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. MARINO (for himself and Mr. CARTWRIGHT):

H.R. 560. A bill to amend the Delaware Water Gap National Recreation Area Improvement Act to provide access to certain vehicles serving residents of municipalities adjacent to the Delaware Water Gap National Recreation Area, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. MESSER:

H.R. 561. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modify the definition of

applicable large employer for purposes of the employer mandate in the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MESSER:

H.R. 562. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to flatline the individual mandate penalty; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MESSER:

H.R. 563. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exempt certain individuals from the individual health insurance mandate; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. POSEY (for himself, Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. YODER, Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky, Ms. JENKINS of Kansas, Ms. ROSLEHTINEN, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. KNIGHT, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. WALKER, Ms. FOX, Mr. HOLDING, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. COLE, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. ROSS, Mr. SCHRADER, Mr. BARLETTA, Mr. YOHO, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. PASCRELL, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. HUDSON, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. EMMER, Mr. LAHOOD, Ms. TITUS, Mr. CURBELO of Florida, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. MAST, Mr. BRAT, Mr. PETERSON, Ms. WILSON of Florida, and Mr. DENHAM):

H.R. 564. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to clarify the Food and Drug Administration's jurisdiction over certain tobacco products, and to protect jobs and small businesses involved in the sale, manufacturing and distribution of traditional and premium cigars; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. ROHRBACHER (for himself, Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. BISHOP of Michigan, Mr. WEBSTER of Florida, and Mr. GROTHMAN):

H.R. 565. A bill to recognize that Christians and Yazidis in Iraq, Syria, Pakistan, Iran, and Libya are targets of genocide, and to provide for the expedited processing of immigrant and refugee visas for such individuals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. ROSKAM (for himself, Mr. SHERMAN, and Mr. ZELDIN):

H.R. 566. A bill to require the President to report on the use by the Government of Iran of commercial aircraft and related services for illicit military or other activities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Ms. SÁNCHEZ (for herself, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. CICILLINE, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, Mr. O'HALLERAN, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. ELLISON, Ms. JAYAPAL, Ms. PINGREE, and Mr. SARBANES):

H.R. 567. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to clarify the application of the restriction on the appointment of relatives to a position in the Federal Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Ms. SÁNCHEZ (for herself, Ms. JAYAPAL, and Ms. VELÁZQUEZ):

H.R. 568. A bill to amend the Ethics in Government Act of 1978 to require certain Federal officials to make requisite financial disclosures within 30 days of assuming office, and for other purposes; to the Committee on

Oversight and Government Reform, and in addition to the Committee on House Administration, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SERRANO:

H.R. 569. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to provide for retroactive calculation since the start of combat operations in Afghanistan of days of certain active duty or active service performed as a member of the Ready Reserve to reduce the eligibility age for receipt of retired pay for non-regular service; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. SERRANO:

H.R. 570. A bill to authorize microenterprise assistance for renewable energy projects in developing countries; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SERRANO:

H.R. 571. A bill to permit members of the House of Representatives to donate used computer equipment to public elementary and secondary schools designated by the members; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. SERRANO:

H.R. 572. A bill to facilitate the export of United States agricultural products to Cuba as authorized by the Trade Sanctions Reform and Export Enhancement Act of 2000, to remove impediments to the export to Cuba of medical devices and medicines, to allow travel to Cuba by United States legal residents, to establish an agricultural export promotion program with respect to Cuba, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, the Judiciary, Agriculture, and Financial Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SERRANO:

H.R. 573. A bill to waive certain prohibitions with respect to nationals of Cuba coming to the United States to play organized professional baseball; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SERRANO:

H.R. 574. A bill to lift the trade embargo on Cuba, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, Energy and Commerce, Financial Services, the Judiciary, Oversight and Government Reform, and Agriculture, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SESSIONS:

H.R. 575. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to establish new procedures and requirements for the registration of cosmetic manufacturing establishments, the submission of cosmetic and ingredient statements, and the reporting of serious cosmetic adverse events, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. TIBERI (for himself, Mr. DELANEY, Mr. MACARTHUR, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. POLIS, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana, Mrs. WALORSKI, and Mr. PAULSEN):

H.R. 576. A bill to encourage and support partnerships between the public and private

sectors to improve our Nation's social programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. TITUS:

H.R. 577. A bill to designate a peak in the State of Nevada as Maude Frazier Mountain; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. WITTMAN (for himself and Mr. ISSA):

H.R. 578. A bill to amend the Servicemembers Civil Relief Act to authorize spouses of servicemembers to elect to use the same residences as the servicemembers; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. YARMUTH (for himself and Mr. SCHWEIKERT):

H.R. 579. A bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins in commemoration of Muhammad Ali; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. YARMUTH (for himself, Mr. MEEKS, and Mr. COHEN):

H.R. 580. A bill to establish a grant program to preserve the legacy and ideals of Muhammad Ali and promote global respect, understanding, and communication, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. YOUNG of Iowa:

H.R. 581. A bill to provide for the issuance of a semipostal to support Department of Agriculture conservation programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, and in addition to the Committee on Agriculture, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. ENGEL:

H.J. Res. 28. A joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to protect the voting rights of the citizens of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LOUDERMILK (for himself, Mr. CARTER of Georgia, Mr. BARTON, Mr. GRIFFITH, Mr. BRAT, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, Mrs. NOEM, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, Mr. GOWDY, and Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia):

H.J. Res. 29. A joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States requiring that the Federal budget be balanced; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. FUDGE (for herself, Ms. ADAMS, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. EVANS, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. HASTINGS, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. JAYAPAL, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Ms. KAPTUR, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Ms. LEE, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MEEKS, Ms. MOORE, Mr. NADLER, Ms. NORTON, Mr. PAYNE, Ms. PINGREE, Ms. PLASKETT, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. RASKIN, Mr. RICHMOND, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. RUSH, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. SERRANO, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr.

SOTO, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Ms. TITUS, Mr. TONKO, Mr. VEASEY, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. BROWN of Maryland, Mr. CLAY, Mr. LAWSON of Florida, Mr. McEACHIN, and Ms. WILSON of Florida):

H. Con. Res. 9. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that a day should be designated as "National Voting Rights Act Mobilization Day"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. PAULSEN (for himself and Mr. KIND):

H. Con. Res. 10. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that tax-exempt fraternal benefit societies have historically and continue to provide critical benefits to Americans and United States communities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS:

H. Res. 51. A resolution electing Members to certain standing committees of the House of Representatives; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. CROWLEY:

H. Res. 52. A resolution electing Members to certain standing committees of the House of Representatives; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. LATTA:

H. Res. 53. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that in order to continue aggressive growth in the Nation's telecommunications and technology industries, the United States Government should "Get Out of the Way and Stay Out of the Way"; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

### CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey:

H.R. 7.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority on which this bill is based is Congress's power under the Spending Clause in Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution.

By Mr. CALVERT:

H.R. 514.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority of Congress to enact this legislation is Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution, specifically Clauses 1 (relating to providing for the general welfare of the United States) and 18 (relating to the power to make all laws necessary and proper for carrying out the powers vested in Congress) of such section.

OR

The constitutional authority of Congress to enact this legislation is Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 and Clause 18.

By Mr. ELLISON:

H.R. 515.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause I.

By Mr. ELLISON:

H.R. 516.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 7, Clause 1 and Section 8, Clause 1.

By Mr. ELLISON:

H.R. 517.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 and Clause 3.

By Ms. DEGETTE:

H.R. 518.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3

By Mr. BUCK:

H.R. 519.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

"The Congress shall have Power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts, and Excises, to pay the Debts, and provide for the common Defense and General Welfare of the United States; but all Duties and Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States."

By Mr. AMODEI:

H.R. 520.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority of Congress to enact this legislation is provided by Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution, specifically clause 1 (relating to providing for the general welfare of the United States) and clause 18 (relating to the power to make all laws necessary and proper for carrying out the powers vested in Congress), and Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2 (relating to the power of Congress to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory or other property belonging to the United States).

By Mr. AMODEI:

H.R. 521.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States . . . .

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

By Mr. GOODLATTE:

H.R. 522.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 9, Clause 7 of the United States Constitution, in that the legislation concerns the Appropriations Power granted to Congress by that section;

Article I, Section 7, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution, in that the legislation concerns the legislative powers granted to Congress by that section;

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution, in that the legislation exercises legislative power granted to Congress by that clause "to make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested in this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof"

By Mr. MARCHANT:

H.R. 523.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

U.S. Constitution Art. I Sec. 8 cl. 2, under the power "To borrow Money on the credit of the United States"; and

Art. I Sec. 8 cl. 18, under the power "To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof."

By Mr. LAMBORN:

H.R. 524.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 3 of Section 8 of Article 1 of the Constitution states that Congress has the authority to "regulate Commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states."

By Mr. CRAWFORD:

H.R. 525.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the enumerate powers listed in Article 1, Section 8 of the US Constitution, to regulate Commerce with Foreign Nations.

By Mr. KATKO:

H.R. 526.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18—To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof

By Mr. BISHOP of Utah:

H.R. 527.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 provides authority to Congress to provide for the common Defense and general Welfare of the United States; as well as to make provisions and regulations for the military forces of the United States. Since federal land use restrictions implemented by the Department of Interior ostensibly to protect habitat for the Greater Sage Grouse also negatively impact several vital military installations and training facilities in the Western United States, the Congress has authority under Section 8 to act to mitigate negative impacts of the federal land use restrictions in order to preserve national defense readiness, while at the same time, respecting the 10th Amendment prerogatives of the States for the management of wildlife within their state boundaries through the facilitation of their respective state wildlife management plans for the preservation and recovery of the Greater Sage Grouse.

By Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 528.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8 of the U. S. Constitution, which grants Congress the power to "lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts, and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common defense and general Welfare of the United States."

By Ms. JENKINS of Kansas:

H.R. 529.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I:Section 8:

The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defense and general Welfare of the United States.

By Mr. ENGEL:

H.R. 530.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the Constitution.

By Mr. HILL:

H.R. 531.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

By Mr. O'ROURKE:

H.R. 532.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 18 of Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution:

To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by the Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Office thereof.

By Mr. EMMER:

H.R. 533.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

(Clause 1, Section 8 of Article 1 of the United States Constitution which reads: "The Congress shall have Power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts, and Excises, to pay the Debts, and provide for the common Defense and General Welfare of the United States; but all Duties and Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.")

By Mr. EMMER:

H.R. 534.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

(Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following: Article 1 Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution grants Congress the authority to regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states, and with the Indian tribes.)

By Mr. CHABOT:

H.R. 535.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. BIGGS:

H.R. 536.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 enumerated powers.

By Mr. BIGGS:

H.R. 537.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 enumerated powers

By Mr. BISHOP of Georgia:

H.R. 538.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Art. I, Section 8, clause 3: To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes;

By Mrs. BLACKBURN:

H.R. 539.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18

By Mr. CICILLINE:

H.R. 540.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. COLLINS of New York:

H.R. 541.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. COLLINS of New York:

H.R. 542.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. COLLINS of New York:

H.R. 543.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. COOK:

H.R. 544.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. CRAMER:

H.R. 545.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority on which this bill rests is the power of Congress to regulate Commerce with foreign Nations in Article I,

Section 8 of the United States Constitution, specifically Clause 3.

By Mr. CULBERSON:

H.R. 546.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 4 and Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

By Ms. DELAURO:

H.R. 547.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. DENT:

H.R. 548.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

In the power of Congress to provide for the general welfare, to regulate commerce, and to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution Federal powers (section 8 article I of the Constitution)

By Mr. DONOVAN:

H.R. 549.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. ENGEL:

H.R. 550.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

U.S. Const. Art. I §1; and

U.S. Const. Art. I §8

By Mr. FORTENBERRY:

H.R. 551.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. FORTENBERRY:

H.R. 552.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. JODY B. RICE of Georgia:

H.R. 553.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2, which states:

"The Congress shall have Power to dispose of and make all needful Rules and Regulations respecting the Territory or other Property belonging to the United States . . ."

By Mr. KILDEE:

H.R. 554.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8.

By Mr. KINZINGER:

H.R. 555.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Fourteenth Amendment, Section 1 [Rights Guaranteed]; . . . the means employed to effect its exercise may be neither arbitrary nor oppressive but must bear a real and substantial relation to an end that is public, specifically, the public health, safety, or morals, or some other aspect of the general welfare.

By Mr. LANCE:

H.R. 556.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3: Congress shall have the power to regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

By Mr. LATTA:

H.R. 557.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3: Congress shall have the Power . . . "to regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian tribes."

By Mr. LOUDERMILK:

H.R. 558.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2: The Congress shall have Power to dispose of and make all needful Rules and Regulations respecting the Territory or other Property belonging to the United States; and nothing in this Constitution shall be so construed as to Prejudice any Claims of the United States, or of any particular State.

By Mr. LOUDERMILK:

H.R. 559.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Art. I, Sec. 8, cl. 18

To make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. MARINO:

H.R. 560.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18, To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. MESSER:

H.R. 561.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

By Mr. MESSER:

H.R. 562.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 3 of Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution.

By Mr. MESSER:

H.R. 563.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3 of the U.S. Constitution: To regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states, and with the Indian tribes.

By Mr. POSEY:

H.R. 564.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18

By Mr. ROHRBACHER:

H.R. 565.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, clause 4 of the United States Constitution, which gives Congress the power "To establish a uniform Rule of Naturalization, and uniform Laws on the subject of Bankruptcies throughout the United States."

By Mr. ROSKAM:

H.R. 566.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1 of the Constitution.

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3 of the Constitution.

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18 of the Constitution.

By Ms. SÁNCHEZ:

H.R. 567.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article One, section 8, clause 18:

Congress shall have Power—To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Pow-

ers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department of Officer thereof.

By Ms. SÁNCHEZ:

H.R. 568.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article One, section 8, clause 18:

Congress shall have Power—To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department of Officer thereof.

By Mr. SERRANO:

H.R. 569.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8, of the Constitution (clauses 12, 13, 14, 16, and 18), which grants Congress the power to raise and support an Army; to provide and maintain a Navy; to make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces; to provide for organizing, arming and disciplining the militia; and to make all laws necessary and proper for carrying out the foregoing powers.

By Mr. SERRANO:

H.R. 570.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution

By Mr. SERRANO:

H.R. 571.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 2 of section 5 of article I of the Constitution, which states: "Each House may determine the Rules of its Proceedings, punish its Members for disorderly Behaviour, and, with the Concurrence of two thirds, expel a Member."

Additionally, Congress has the power to enact this legislation under Clause 2 of section 3 of article IV of the Constitution, which states that "The Congress shall have Power to dispose of and make all needful Rules and Regulations respecting the Territory or other Property belonging to the United States; and nothing in this Constitution shall be so construed as to Prejudice any Claims of the United States, or of any particular State."

By Mr. SERRANO:

H.R. 572.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, clause 3 of the Constitution

By Mr. SERRANO:

H.R. 573.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, clause 3 of the Constitution

Article I, Section 8, clause 4 of the Constitution

Article I, Section 8, clause 18 of the Constitution

By Mr. SERRANO:

H.R. 574.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, clause 3 of the Constitution

Article I, Section 8, clause 18 of the Constitution

By Mr. SESSIONS:

H.R. 575.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3:

Congress shall have the Power to regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

By Mr. TIBERI:

H.R. 576.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution, to "provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States."

By Ms. TITUS:

H.R. 577.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Congress enacts this bill pursuant to Clause 18 of Section 8 of Article I of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. WITTMAN:

H.R. 578.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clauses 1 and 18

By Mr. YARMUTH:

H.R. 579.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution.

By Mr. YARMUTH:

H.R. 580.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution.

By Mr. YOUNG of Iowa:

H.R. 581.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. ENGEL:

H.J. Res. 28.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

U.S. Const. Art. V

By Mr. LOUDERMILK:

H.J. Res. 29.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article V of the Constitution, which grants Congress the authority, whenever two thirds of both chambers deem it necessary, to propose amendments to the Constitution.

#### ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 24: Mr. BLUM, Mr. HURD, Mr. GOWDY, Mr. TURNER, Mr. ROKITA, Mr. KATKO, Mr. BABIN, Mr. JORDAN, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, and Mr. WITTMAN.

H.R. 29: Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia and Mr. ROTHFUS.

H.R. 36: Mr. ROKITA, Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. STEWART, Mr. HILL, Mr. BUCSHON, Mr. EMMER, Mr. YODER, Mr. SCALISE, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. BABIN, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. PALAZZO, Mr. WITTMAN, and Mr. AMASH.

H.R. 37: Mr. ROKITA, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. STEWART, Mr. EMMER, Mr. YODER, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. BABIN, Mr. CARTER of Georgia, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. BRIDENSTINE, Mr. WITTMAN, and Mr. PALAZZO.

H.R. 38: Mr. BISHOP of Michigan, Mr. WALBERG, Mr. COLLINS of New York, Mr. BARLETTA, Mr. DENHAM, Mr. WITTMAN, and Mr. BYRNE.

H.R. 60: Mr. KING of New York, Mrs. TORRES, Mr. STEWART, and Mr. THOMAS J. ROONEY of Florida.

H.R. 80: Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. STEWART, Ms. CHENEY, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. LANCE, Mr. CRAMER, and Mr. FARENTHOLD.

H.R. 82: Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. YOHIO, Mr. ABRAHAM, Mrs. NOEM, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. BROOKS of



Alabama, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GROTHMAN, Ms. CHENEY, Mr. BARR, Mr. HUNTER, and Mr. GARRETT.

H.R. 113: Mr. TONKO, Ms. TSONGAS, and Ms. BROWNLEY of California.

H.R. 115: Mr. GAETZ.

H.R. 116: Mr. WITTMAN.

H.R. 147: Mr. ROKITA, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. STEWART, Mr. EMMER, Mr. YODER, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. BABIN, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. BRIDENSTINE, and Mr. PALAZZO.

H.R. 161: Mr. BISHOP of Georgia.

H.R. 173: Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. SERRANO, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. BARLETTA, and Mr. EMMER.

H.R. 198: Ms. BEUTLER, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. RATCLIFFE, Mr. HILL, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, Mr. GARRETT, Mr. CARTER of Texas, Mr. KNIGHT, Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana, and Mr. JORDAN.

H.R. 244: Ms. ESTY.

H.R. 246: Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mr. CURBELO of Florida, Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, Mr. BLUM, Mrs. COMSTOCK, and Mr. WITTMAN.

H.R. 257: Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio.

H.R. 299: Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Ms. GABBARD, Mr. JENKINS of West Virginia, Mr. VELA, Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas, Mr. COLE, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. LANCE, Mr. TONKO, Mr. HILL, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. POCAN, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. OLSON, Mr. DUFFY, Mr. COSTA, Mr. KIND, Mr. MACARTHUR, Ms. MENG, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. SIRES, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Ms. SANCHEZ, Mr. GRIFFITH, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia,

Ms. ESTY, and Mr. SWALWELL of California.

H.R. 333: Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. JONES, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. SOTO, and Mr. PETERS.

H.R. 350: Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. BISHOP of Michigan, and Mr. MACARTHUR.

H.R. 355: Mr. GRIFFITH, Mr. GOWDY, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, and Mrs. WALORSKI.

H.R. 358: Mr. BURGESS and Mr. WITTMAN.

H.R. 360: Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. NORTON, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. CLAY, and Mr. SOTO.

H.R. 367: Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. WALBERG, Mr. MARCHANT, Mrs. WALORSKI, Mr. HILL, and Mr. WITTMAN.

H.R. 369: Mr. KNIGHT.

H.R. 371: Ms. LOFGREN, Ms. JAYAPAL, Mr. SIRES, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. KIHUEN, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Ms. ESTY, Mr. SCHNEIDER, and Mrs. LOWEY.

H.R. 377: Mr. ZELDIN and Mr. JOYCE of Ohio.

H.R. 390: Mr. GOWDY.

H.R. 406: Mr. MOULTON, Mrs. RADEWAGEN, and Mr. RYAN of Ohio.

H.R. 411: Ms. GABBARD, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MARSHALL, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. WELCH, Mr. GARAMENDI, and Mr. SWALWELL of California.

H.R. 432: Mr. DEFazio and Mr. GRIJALVA.

H.R. 437: Mr. KING of New York.

H.R. 439: Miss RICE of New York.

H.R. 441: Mr. CRAMER.

H.R. 442: Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania and Mr. PAULSEN.

H.R. 459: Mr. LUETKEMEYER.

H.R. 471: Mr. LARSON of Connecticut.

H.R. 475: Mr. NEWHOUSE.

H.R. 499: Mr. BIGGS.

H.R. 502: Mr. REICHERT, Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania, Mr. LOBIONDO, Ms. TSONGAS,

Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Ms. STEFANK, and Mr. LOWENTHAL.

H.R. 505: Mr. FITZPATRICK.

H.R. 512: Mrs. TORRES, Ms. HANABUSA, Ms. STEFANK, and Mr. COFFMAN.

H.J. Res. 11: Mr. FLORES.

H.J. Res. 26: Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. WELCH, Mr. DESAULNIER, and Mr. GRIJALVA.

H.J. Res. 27: Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. KELLY of Mississippi, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. ADERHOLT, and Mr. ROUZER.

H. Con. Res. 5: Mr. CICILLINE.

H. Res. 20: Ms. BORDALLO.

H. Res. 23: Mr. SWALWELL of California and Ms. MOORE.

H. Res. 28: Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. SERRANO, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. AGUILAR, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. POCAN, Ms. NORTON, Ms. SANCHEZ, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. DEFazio, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. FASO, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Ms. TITUS, Mr. WALZ, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. RUSH, Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. VELA, Mr. MCKINLEY, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. JENKINS of West Virginia, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mrs. BUSTOS, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. GRIFFITH, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. SIRES, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. JEFFRIES, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Ms. BASS, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. QUIGLEY, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. BEUTLER, Mr. WELCH, and Ms. DEGETTE.